DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 125 524	IR 003 309
TITLE	Library and User Requirements and Orientation Techniques. Subgroup C; Interim Report.
INSTITUTION	California Univ., Los Angeles. Library.
PUB DATE	Jul 74
NOTE	109p.; For related documents see ED 121 322-324
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Bibliographies; *Catalogs; Higher Education; Librarians; Library Circulation; Library Collections; *Library Reference Services; *Library Surveys; Literature Reviews; Questionnaires; Statistical Data; *University Libraries; *Use Studies
IDENTIFIERS	University of California Los Angeles

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to observe the behavior and problems of the users of University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA) dictionary library catalog. The study group's activities included: (1) a literature search and the abstracting of catalog use surveys; (2) personal interviews with representatives of library units to obtain information about problems encountered in the use of public catalogs; (3) personal interviews with selected faculty; (4) a test user survey; and (5) a survey of catalog-related assistance. It was concluded that the use of the card catalog is distributed equally between graduate and undergraduate students, the user is unsure of the nature of the catalog, the physical arrangement of the catalog is threatening, and the filing structure is responsible for much difficulty. Despite the numerous problems, the general reaction to the UCLA University Research Library (URL) card catalog was favorable. A 59-item bibliography is included. A record of activity of the URL reference desk, task force reports, and the task force user questionnaire are appended. (Author/DS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED125524

Appendix VI

U C L A

Working Group on Public Catalogs

Subgroup C - Interim Report

Library and User Requirements and Orientation Techniques

July 1974

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Members

Jean Aroeste
Diane Kennedy (until April 1, 1974)
James Mink
Roberta Nixon
Frances Zeitlin

IR003309

INTRODUCTION

This document is a working paper prepared by a subcommittee of the UCLA Working Group on Public Catalogs. The material included consists of preliminary data gathered for analysis and consideration by the full Working Group during the course of their study.

WORKING GROUP ON PUBLIC CATALOGS

SUBGROUP C REPORT

Contents:

Preface and Acknowledgements

- I. Literature Search
- II. Interviews
  - A. Unit Interviews
  - B. Interviews with Staff and Faculty Authorities
- III. User Surveys
  - Appendix A: The Reference Survey
  - Appendix B: The Task Force Card Catalog Project Reports
  - Appendix C: The Task Force User Questionnaire
- IV. Summary of Findings
- V. Recommendations

Subgroup C

Jean Aroeste
Diane Kennedy (until April 1, 1974)
James Mink
Roberta Nixon
Frances Zeitlin

WORKING GROUP ON PUBLIC CATALOGS

Report of Subgroup C: User Requirements

Subgroup C was assigned the task of studying the behavior and problems of users of library catalogs in general and within the UCLA Library system in particular. The Subgroup's activities included:

I. Literature search and abstracting of catalog use surveys and other articles dealing with the various aspects of catalog use.

II. Personal interviews with heads and other representatives of Library units to obtain information about problems encountered in the use of public catalogs by the units' readers and staff.

III. Personal interviews with selected faculty and staff authorities.

IV. A test user survey conducted by the Task Force in the URL.

V. A survey of catalog-related assistance provided by the URL Reference staff.

Use was also made of supporting data obtained from Circulation Department statistics and from reports of the Task Force public catalog project of 1973/74.

Subgroup C wishes to thank the fifty or more staff members who so generously contributed time and thought to the unit interviews; the URL Reference staff and the Task Force staff; members of Subgroup B who called to our attention various items in the literature; Edith M. Fuller, who provided pertinent data on interlibrary loan requests; Eleanore Friedgood, Charles Gullans and Seymour Lubetsky; and Carol Petrovsky, who tracked down items identified in the literature search.

I. Literature Search

Contents

- A. Approach to the Literature
- B. History of Catalog Use Surveys and the Major Surveys
- C. Methodology of Catalog Use Surveys
- D. Who Uses the Catalog?
- E. The Subject Search
- F. Form of the Catalog
  - 1. Book versus Card
  - 2. Dictionary versus Divided
- G. Summaries
  - 1. Summary of Conclusions
    - a. Conclusions on which there is General Agreement
    - b. Conclusions on which there is Disagreement
  - 2. Summary of Recommendations
    - a. Recommendations for Inproving Catalogs
    - b. Recommendations for further Research
- H. General Observations
- I. Bibliography

A. APPROACH TO THE LITERATURE

Within the large body of literature dealing with theories and problems of the use of the library catalog, Subgroup C tried as far as possible to confine its study to surveys based on data secured directly or indirectly from catalog users. The exact number of such surveys has never been precisely determined. In his comprehensive review of catalog use studies Krikelas (29)* identified fifty-four from 1931 to 1970, reported in more than sixty articles, papers, theses, dissertations, and books. We selected twenty of these reports for careful study, plus seven not included by Krikelas and an additional eight published after 1970. We also studied a number of works on the theory of catalog use and the methodology of user surveys.

Citations to the literature were gathered from two published bibliographies of user studies (16, 17), from bibliographies in books and articles, from listings in Library Literature, and from shelf examination of current library periodicals. To make sure that significant items had not been missed, we relied on the resumes of Krikelas and Frarey (24).

Because of the nature of the subject, we did not limit our reading to works published within the last ten years, but our study of the period before 1964 was confined to materials of particular importance. We tried to cover all relevant surveys published since 1966. Our reading was restricted to works dealing with British and American libraries and, for the most part, academic and large research libraries.

The general search for the literature was conducted by one member of the subgroup, who reviewed the materials and selected those considered important enough for study. The materials so selected were distributed among all the members of the subgroup for reading and abstracting. Findings were then compared for areas of agreement and disagreement, important or interesting observations and conclusions, and indications of areas in which further study was needed.

---

*Note: Numbers enclosed within parentheses indicate the corresponding item in the Bibliography

B. HISTORY OF CATALOG USE SURVEYS AND THE MAJOR SURVEYS

Before 1931, the perennial discussion of the library catalog--its philosophy, its problems, its costs--had indicated some concern for the user, but without passing beyond the stage of general impressions and theories. Susan Akers' pioneering article of 1931, entitled "To What Extent do the Students of the Liberal-Arts Colleges Use the Bibliographic Items Given on the Catalogue Card?" (1) was the first effort to make an objective evaluation of catalog use and users. It was motivated by the idea that "to make a good catalogue it is necessary to know the needs of the users of that catalogue." Further studies should explore the possibility that "there may well be as many different kinds of catalogues as there are types of libraries and types of users."

Akers attempted to discover what items on catalog cards were used, how well they were understood, and what additional items might be found useful. Checklists were sent to librarians of ten liberal arts colleges, to be distributed by each to thirty students who were frequent users of the catalog. The lists were checked by 257 students. Questions covered types of entry, bibliographical items such as date, publisher, series, etc., and abbreviations such as "rev. ed.", "tr.", "illus.", etc. Students were requested to suggest other types of information that would be useful on a catalog card.

Findings of the survey indicated that the students did not know how to use the catalog, and did not know about other bibliographical aids. The most frequently suggested type of additional information was the provision of more information about the nature and contents of the book, and the nationality and school of thought of the author. Less use of abbreviations and greater clarity of terminology were strongly indicated. Akers concluded that "either the catalogue must be made self-explanatory or there must be a better system of instructing students in its use than now exists."

Between the Akers survey of 1931 and the publication of the far-reaching American Library Association survey in 1958 thirty-two catalog use surveys of various sizes and structures were produced. Attempts were made to discover who uses the catalog, for what purpose, with what approach, and with what success. A fair amount of consensus developed on a number of points:

a) The library patron makes relatively little use of the catalog.

b) The typical user is a student, more often male than female, who is looking for material to complete a class assignment.

c) The non-specialist makes more use of the subject heading than the specialist.

d) Most use of the subject catalog is for materials in English of fairly recent date.

e) The items of information on catalog cards most used are: author, title, subject heading, date of publication, and call-number. (There is some disagreement on the order of importance of the five items).

f) The rate of success in using the catalog is high.

g) Librarians have not done an effective job in teaching the use of the catalog.

Considerable disagreement had already developed regarding what is now called the "known-item" search versus the subject search. (A "known item" is a document known or believed to exist, about which the user has some information). Most surveys found their use to be about equal, and this finding was reported by Frarey (24) as a generally accepted conclusion. However, indications that the percentage of known-item searches increases proportionately as the academic level of the user rises had already been noted (12, 38, 39, 50).

Disagreement had also developed regarding the value of items of information on the catalog other than the leading five. Akers, Miller (40), Spalding (50) pointed out that different kinds of users had different needs, and different kinds of libraries needed different standards. Arbitrary elimination of certain types of information, or added entries, would cause hardship to many users.

A number of studies indicated the lack of perseverance of most catalog users, and their tendency to give up after meeting with failure after one or two attempts to find information in the catalog.

American Library Assoication Survey, 1955-56.

This monumental survey, known as the Jackson study (2) and published in 1958, was conducted by interviews based on questionnaires with 5,700 patrons in thirty-nine libraries throughout the United States, ranging from academic, public and special to small high school libraries. Its purposes were:

a) To identify the demands made on the catalog by its users;

b) To measure the adequacy with which the catalog is meeting these demands;

c) To isolate areas in need of more thorough investigation;

d) To provide a more reliable interview form and related tools.

The following findings were reported:

a) All catalogs tested were used successfully and apparently to the patron's satisfaction in the large majority of cases;

b) Many cases of failure were due to the incorrect or incomplete bibliographical data with which the patron had approached the catalog;

c) The patron's inexperience and unfamiliarity with the catalog was a principal source of difficulty;

d) Not all staff members were more skilled than the patron in using the catalog;

e) The incidence of failure wasindirectlyrelated to the size of the catalog;

f) The patron usually consulted only one subject heading during a particular subject search;

g) Joint author entries were apparently used only in rare instances;

h) Subject cards under a given heading were selected by date of publication more than four times as often as by alphabetical position;

i) Known-item searches were frequently unsuccessful, probably because they involved corporate entries, collections, or serials.

Recommendations were:

a) Improving instruction in bibliographical citation in schools and colleges;

b) Warning instructors against exclusive oral citations;

c) Making more instruction in catalog use available at the catalog;

d) Training librarians in the use of a specific catalog;

e) Providing more signs and guide cards;

f) Having staff members on duty at the catalog;

g) Investigating the potential advantages of divided catalogs and divisional or departmental catalogs;

h) Giving serious attention to the synditic struction of the catalog by the use of "see also" cards and the provision of lists of subject headings;

i) Eliminating certain types of joint entries (to be determined by subsequent studies);

j) Giving consideration to the chronological filing of subject cards;

k) Encouraging the use of distinctive title entries;

l) Providing more analytics;

m) Supplementing the catalog with indexes and bibliographies.

Post-ALA and Beginnings of the Computer-Oriented Survey.

For a few years after the publication of the massive ALA effort, there was something of a lull in catalog use surveys.

In 1963, the Reference Services Division of the Library of Congress established a Catalog Use Committee to consider card catalog use, especially as it related to reference service. A pilot study, reported by Perrine (47) was conducted in 1965 to determine the most frequent catalog use difficulties observed by reference librarians. Forms for recording data were sent to reference librarians at twelve university libraries; eleven responded, returning more than 300 completed forms. The responses made it clear that a great deal of the reference librarian's time was devoted to assisting users with the catalog.

The most common difficulties found, in order of number of times reported, were:

a) Subject headings

b) Filing arrangement

c) Lack of see and see also reference

d) Lack of title added entries

e) Lack of bibliographical information

f) Lack of analytics

g) Lack of personal name added entry

h) Lack of any entry

i) Lack of series added entry

Among other difficulties mentioned were: blind entry, inconsistent entry, incorrect call number, card missing from catalog, publication withdrawn, lack of contents of series, lack of location information, and various problems involving divided catalogs.

Probable causes of the difficulties were ranked as:

a) Local policy

b) Local cataloging

c) LC cataloging

d) Clerical error

e) Arrearages

f) Defects in rules

The two most frequently mentioned catalog use difficulties, those concerned with subject headings and filing arrangements, were also the two categories where the probable cause was found least determineable.

The RSD Catalog Use Committee conducted its main study in 1967, also reported by Perrine (46). This time eleven public libraries were included with the twelve university libraries. The same methodology was used, resulting in 647 completed forms. The six most common difficulties were ranked. For the university libraries, the order of the first five remained the same as in the previous survey. The sixth difficulty, ranked second in public libraries, was the call number; this was scarcely mentioned by the university libraries. Filing difficulties led the list at public libraries, and continued to run a close second to subject headings at university libraries. The public libraries, less hesistant in assigning causes, considered problems with filing to be overwhelmingly due to the user's confusion, lack of familiarity with the catalog, etc. But Perrine declared the underlying cause to be the librarians' failure to make filing rules clear to the user.

At both public and university libraries, lack of title added entry was blamed on Library of Congress cataloging policy to a greater extent than was any other problem.

Perrine felt that the studies had not produced a precise diagnosis of the cause of the troubles, but that they had emphasized the "curative role" played by reference librarians.

Beginning in the mid-sixties, and concurrent with the perrine surveys, the idea that the computer might provide the answers to the perennial problems of the catalog was becoming increasingly intriguing. There was a resurgence of information-gathering activity about catalog users, motivated by the hope of making use of this information for computerization.

In 1964 Dubester (20) published an article on the studies of the catalog which were made at the Library of Congress to determine the feasibility of automation of the information system in a large research library. Two studies were reported, one relating to machine memory, the other to answer the question: "Can there be the sophisticated interaction between a human user and the machine memory to permit the type of dialogue which is ever present in the process of using the bibliographic apparatus of a large research library?" This second study, very limited in scope, involved following the preliminary cataloger in the work of searching, to establish how many searches and how much time was required. The figures reported were not compared with any other type of search. The author admitted that the results "must be interpreted more as indications than as reliable facts," and declared that more studies in greater depth must be made.

Also in 1964, Brooks and Kilgour (9) made a study to obtain specific data on the heaviest use of the subject cards in the Yale Medical Library catalog. The data was intended to serve in the design of catalog computerization projects at the medical libraries of Columbia, Harvard, and Yale. In 501 interviews at the dictionary catalog, half with the public, half with staff, they found only 12.8 percent subject searches; if the public only were considered, 17.9 percent. The purposes of a significant number of these subject searches were determined to be: to locate known items; to serve as quick guides to the shelves; or to find a particular form of material, such as a journal. Most known-item searches used the author approach. The conclusion was made that the relatively slight use of the subject catalog showed that the traditional card catalog does not have adequate references to meet new demands. There was an average of 1.6 subject cards per book. Another finding was that materials selected were mainly in English and of recent date.

The user survey made at the International Labour Office in Geneva in 1965, reported by Kenney (28) is an example of a well thought out attempt to achieve a complete picture of the user's library needs and practices, and to arrive at a solution in terms of catalog design. The survey found that the existing catalog was not satisfying all the demands that might be made on it, to a great extent because it was not sufficiently accessible to a large number of people who needed to use it. Reorganization of the old catalog, it was felt, would not have solved this problem, nor the problem of integrating into it pamphlets and offprints which had been cataloged by subject. Cataloging for the existing system was abandoned, and a new catalog begun, consisting of cards comprising conventional bibliographical descriptions and a summary in terms of about 1,000 words established for International Labour Review as descriptors, the cards filed by descriptors, chronologically under each heading. Indexes by subject, author, title, geographical region, report number, and conference were provided. Publications covered included monographs, a selection of articles, and documents of international organizations. The value of this system has still to be tested, and the author thought that another user survey might provide very different results.

A Survey conducted in 1968 by the Aldermaston Mechanised Cataloguing and Ordering System at the Atomic Weapons Research Establishment at Aldermaston, England, was reported by Ayres and others (4). A comparison was made of the accuracy of the author and title information brought to the catalog by the user. A sample of 450 requests received by telephone, mail, and personal interview showed that title information was completely accurate for more than 90 percent of the sample, while author information was completely accurate for less than 75 percent. Of incorrect titles, 2.9 were traceable, 6.7 untraceable. Of incorrect authors, 14 percent were traceable while 11.3 were not. No claim was made for the universality of the findings, and the authors questioned their own technique of measuring, but they considered the results a probable pattern for scientific and technological libraries at least. The authors suggested extending the base of the survey in two ways: by experiements with certain types of files, such as order files, in individual libraries, and by a national survey covering a wide range of libraries.

In 1970, the results of three large-scale surveys at large libraries in the United States were published, all motivated by the possibilities of computerization.

University of Michigan Survey, 1967

The main objective of this study, reported by Palmer in 1970 (44), was to determine if patrons would be able to use successfully a shortened five-term "computer" catalog entry. The conclusion was that such an entry, containing title, author, call-number, subject heading, and date, the data determined to be most used, would not reduce the users' success rate.

To obtain this information, Palmer sought to ascertain who used the catalog, why, and how well. A questionnaire was used, filled out by more than 4,400 users of the General Library catalog.

The answers tended to confirm the findings of previous surveys. Students were the largest group of users, with graduate students accounting for approximately 53 percent of use, even though they represented only 26 percent of the total student body. Undergraduate use was very high, even though the University has a separate undergraduate library.

The relationship between approach and educational level indicated in many previous studies was substantiated. Approximately 70 percent of searches were know-item. By educational level, the percentages were: 64 percent undergraduates, 73 percent graduates, 79 percent faculty. Of known-item searches, 85 percent were successful. The use of foreign language material also rose with educational level: 1 percent undergraduate, 20 percent graduate; 39 percent faculty.

The chief purpose for using the catalog was to complete class assignments. The most used elements of the catalog entry were title, author, call number, subject heading, and date, with the first three the most heavily used. Other elements were used about one-sixth of the time, with the exception of contents notes, which, although infrequently provided, were used by almost one-quarter of those questioned.

The study concurred in the finding that subject approach is used less for older and foreign language materials. The author quoted Merritt's statement that by omitting subject headings for foreign language materials the work load of the cataloger could be reduced by 50 percent while the efficiency of the catalog would be reduced only 6.2 percent (39).

Elrod (22) considers the Palmer study to be the most statistically reliable user survey made to date.

University of Michigan Survey 1968-69.

The purpose of the second survey undertaken at this university, and reported in several studies by Tagliacozzo, Kochen, and Rosenburg published in 1970 (54, 55, 56) was to investigate "that aspect of information-seeking behavior which has to do with searching through a directory." (55) It was stated that "other forms of directory, such as a subject index, a telephone book, a guide, an encyclopedia, could as well have served the purpose. The ultimate goals of the survey were to improve the information systems of the present, and lay the foundations for the automatic systems of the future.

Patterns of behavior of the users of the card catalogs of four libraries were studied--the General, Undergraduate, and Medical Libraries of the University of Michigan, and the Ann Arbor Public Library. A total of 2,681 interviews were taken with a randomly selected sample, the technique being open-ended oral interviews in combination with observation of the users' behavior at the catalog.

At the Public, Undergraduate, and Graduate Libraries, known-item searches constituted 49.5 percent, 68 percent, and 71.7 percent, respectively. At the Medical Library, where the largest number of users were graduate students and faculty, 65.5 percent of the searches were known item and 32.4 percent subject.

In regard to approach to known items, 85.2 percent of users preferred the author approach, even though 70 percent had perfect or nearly perfect information on the title, while only 41.9 percent had perfect information on the author. The investigators speculated as to whether the reasons for the author preference were early training, habit, previous disappointing experiences, the user's mistrust of his knowledge of filing rules, or simple ignorance. They reached the conclusion that there should be a larger role for titles in present and future catalogs.

There was a far higher correlation between author search success and precise knowledge of the author's name than between title search success and correct knowledge of the title. A small minority used the subject approach as the first attempt to locate a known item.

User perseverance was very low; more than half the users gave up if they did not find the desired item on the first try. Second tries were almost equally divided among author, title, and subject. Third tries, when they were made, showed a sharp increase in subject approach to a known item.

Frequency of catalog use had doubtful validity as an indicator of proficiency at the catalog.

Judging the success of a known-item search was more difficult than it might seem, since the users' true objectives were not known. Success is known-item searches was given as 81 percent in General Library, and dropped to 60.5 percent in the Public Library. After correction by taking into account materials not in the library, search failure rates dropped from 39.5 percent in the Public Library to 7.2 percent, and from 19 percent in the General Library to 13.7 percent.

Evaluation of success of subject searches is far more difficult, requiring the establishment of degrees of agreement between subject headings and the searchers' terminology. Matching ranged from 96 percent in the General Library to 89 percent in the Public Library. Once terms were selected, the failure rates were 19.1 percent for the Medical Library, 19.1 in the Undergraduate Library, 15.7 percent in the General Library, and 14.4 percent in the Public Library. But more than half the people who were making subject searches in all libraries met with disappointment somewhere along the way.

Yale University Library Survey, 1968-69.

A study of users of the card catalog at the Sterling Memorial Library was conducted over a period of more than a year, and reported by Lipetz in 1970 (33). The immediate purpose was to study possible modification of subject cataloging; the ultimate purpose was the collection of data for eventual computerization. An important and unusual feature of the study was its inclusion of a report on total catalog use over a period of a year - 320,000. Many complaints have been voiced at the lack of such information, and assertions made of the necessity for knowing the total volume of use that is being talked about before valid conclusions can be reached. Of related importance was the finding of a close correlation between circulation figures and catalog use. If this correlation should be corroborated by future studies, a useful tool will be made available to surveyors of library use.

A selected sample of 2,134 catalog users was studied by preliminary interview, observation at the catalog, and follow-up interview. The major categories of users were graduate students (the largest group in the student body) 35.5 percent, undergraduates 31.9 percent, "outsiders" 20 percent, and faculty-staff (not including library staff) 12.1 percent. In proportion to their numbers in the University population, upper classmen made the heaviest use of the catalog.

Known-item searches predominated with 73 percent, followed by 16 percent subject searches, 6 percent "author" searches (in the sense of a search for the complete works of a particular author, institution, etc.) and 5 percent bibliographic. However, interviews revealed that the known-item search was frequently a concealed subject search. After analysis of users' objectives, the figures change to 56 percent known-item searches and 33 percent subject searches. Of known-item searches, the success or failure of 98 percent was determined at the catalog, but in 40 percent of subject searches and 30 percent of "author" searches the user was obliged to go to other sources to supplement the catalog search.

The author approach dominated in known-item searches, accounting for 62 percent, with 28.5 percent by title, a 4.5 percent by subject, and 5 percent by editor, series, or some other access point. Of known-item searches, 84 percent were successful. With correction for the fact that the library lacked the material in question, the figure becomes 93 percent. The success rate for subjects was judged to be about the same! Freshman had the same success rate as other academic levels.

User information about titles was found to be slightly more accurate than about authors. Information on publication dates was highly inaccurate, 50 percent of users either having no information or turning out to be more than five years off.

Among Lipetz's conclusions were:

a) Expansion of the library's collections and better orientation of catalog users would do more to improve success in catalog use than modification or expansion of catalog entries;

b) Usability would be improved by chronological filing of subject cards;

c) Neither the author nor the title approach has an overwhelming advantage;

d) "Simplistic" cataloging by computer would be unsatisfactory;

e) More access should be provided by more "title-like" entries.

He found previous catalog surveys inconclusive and unsatisfactory, and was greatly impressed with the superiority of the human mind over the computer in its ability to correlate and interpret misleading clues.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO 1966-72.

"Requirement Studies for Future Catalogs" is the overall title of a series of studies conducted by the University of Chicago Graduate Library School over a period of seven years--the most extensive experimental survey of library catalog users ever undertaken. Its findings have been reported in a number of published articles, Master's theses, and unpublished papers. Final results were summarized by Swanson in 1972 (53).

According to Swanson, the common goal of the studies can be expressed as a question: "What information should be recorded in future library catalogs, and how should it be organized, presented, and searched in order to be best adapted to the needs of those who seek library materials?" The primary concern is "the development of a goal for catalog design and ... the fuller identification of the purposes which the catalog should serve." The needs of those who do not use the catalog should be ascertained. It is assumed that the needs of those who do use present catalogs are conditioned by their experiences, and might be changed.

The studies were limited to the search for known items; a number of justifications were adduced for the failure to deal with subject access.

Among the works produced by this project are: a survey of card catalog use studies from 1949-64 (41); a questionnaire and interview survey of what information the catalog user brings to the catalog (6); an article on the potential usefulness of catalog access points by non-standard book charactertistics (16); an analysis of the problem of congestion at catalogs (7); and a timing study of the manual searching of catalogs (3).

The major effort of the project was the "Book Memory Experiment," published as Progress Report No. 2 (15). This is actually a series of experiments to determine "what people remember about a book they have once seen that might be helpful in retrieving a book from the library at some later date." The intent was not so much to help people retrieve partially remembered books, but to find a set of types of characteristics that people recall about a book that might be useful for multiple corrdinate searching in automatic systems. An elaborately contrived experiment set a group of people to examining lists of books on psychology, selecting titles, finding the books, looking at them, and being examined on what they remembered about them a few weeks later.

Cooper was able to give a "memorability ranking" to twenty-four "non-standard" characteristics of books, such as number of pages, color of binding, whether it has an index, contains case histories, etc. This kind of information, useless in a standard catalog, has possibilities for an automated system, where, properly exploited, it might conceivably achieve a 500:1 search length reduction.

The memory data collected was considered a basis for catalog improvement on the assumption that there exists a "hidden market" for the use of a research library catalog, and that a large number of people do not use the catalog because their search clues are inadequate for the access points of the existing catalog. "Future catalogs should incorporate principles of redundancy and multiple-access routes to a much greater extent than they do presently." (53) Title access is particularly important; it should be provided by each separate word of the title, with "suitable provisions for entry by means of singular/plural and other types of word form variation, as well as synonyms." A remedy for the "confusion potential" of corporate entries is to provide multiple points of access to each entry.

Because these additional access points would greatly increase the size of the catalog, a main-entry catalog with a number of special purpose indexes is advocated as a reasonable solution.

United Kingdom Survey 1969-71.

A survey which was not computer oriented was carried out between 1969 and 1971 by fifteen library schools of the United Kingdom, on behalf of the Cataloguing and Indexing Group of the Library Association. Findings were reported in studies made by Maltby and Duxbury and published in 1972 and 1973 (35, 37).

The objective of the study was to ascertain, as far as possible, the "consumer's" viewpoint of the library catalog. According to Maltby, much of present cataloging practices is based on a long-term consensus of librarians' impressions and ideas rather than on objective knowledge (not a brand-new thought by now!) The consumer's viewpoint may be unreliable, but deserves attention since it has hitherto been neglected. Bringing together the ideas of the librarian and the consumer should produce the optimum in cataloging procedures and cataloging provision.

Two pilot studies and a preliminary exploratory study (35, 37) were made in advance of the full scale investigation, which surveyed fifty libraries. Public, national, university, college, and polytechnic libraries were included, but special libraries were not. The method used was the structured interview, based on a questionnaire. Library staff was not interviewed, since it was found impossible to devise a questionnaire suitable for both librarians and readers.

A major feature of the survey was its inclusion of non-users of the catalog. Of 3,252 library users interviewed, only 1,914 (59 percent) ever used the catalog at all. Those who did included 76 percent of university library and 75 percent of college library users; but although only 24 percent used the catalog very rarely. Those who used the library most used the catalog most. Readers who had received help and guidance, generally from librarians, but sometimes from teachers or from printed sources, were much more likely to be catalog users.

In university libraries, the known-item search predominated, and the author approach to the known item was the overwhelming favorite, used four times as much as the title approach. Although the title approach was little used, readers asked for more title entries, and might use them if they felt they were available. Where divided catalogs were involved, author/title catalogs were considered easier to use than subject catalogs.

Of the descriptive items on a catalog card, the most used were date, publisher, and edition. Other items were little used. The chief use of the catalog was to see if the library had a book, and to find its location. Much demand was expressed for contents notes and for concise descriptive annotations on catalog cards.

Among the conclusions from the survey were: more guidance is needed for users; more title entries are needed; conventional bibliographic description is little used, but more contents and descriptive notes should be added; subject catalogs are particularly difficult for readers to handle; call numbers are not always a quick key to location; some readers are unaware of what is or is not feasible in a catalog, but are pleased by attempts to ascertain their point of view; most readers do not know how to find descriptive material in bibliographies, which are not used as catalog substitutes.

C. METHODOLOGY OF CATALOG USE SURVEYS

The methodology of catalog use surveys has been criticized since the first effort in the field, not infrequently within the surveys themselves. Ayres criticized her own reliance on the questionnaire, deciding that the interview method would have been better. She did not, however, take note of the weakness of her basic assumptions: (a) "that the student in the liberal-arts college should use the card catalogue;" (b) "that the librarian knows which students use the card catalogue "more or less frequently;" (c) "that the students, selected by the librarian, would check . . . a list . . . carefully;" (d) that students know and remember what items on the catalogue card they are in the habit of using;" (e) "that students know offhand what information they would like to have on the catalogue card, which is not usually given."

The Jackson report of the ALA survey admitted that the sample, although large, was not scientifically selected. Dubester qualified his findings by mentioning the limited scope of his survey and the smallness of the sample. Perrine mentioned the lack of uniformity of practice among the libraries included in his survey, and the subjective factors involved in answering the questionnaire. Ayres questioned the standard of measurement used for accuracy of authors' names.

A number of publications deal wholly or in large part with the subject of methodology: Tauber (57), Line (32), Wood (58), Maltby, 1971 (36), Chervenie (14).

The early surveys are criticized for their unscientific sampling techniques, their lack of psychological sophistication in the formulation of questions, their lack of objectivity, their lack of comparability with other surveys, and the vagueness of their goals. The most frequent criticism is that the surveys are purely quantitative, relying on statistical tabulations and taking no account of the quality of use and its relation to the purposes of the catalog. There is no agreement on what constitutes a "typical" catalog user, nor on what "success" in the use of the catalog means. Almost every survey or theoretical study sharply questions the validity of most other surveys. The statement that no surveys have discovered anything of value is not infrequently found.

Line declared that "too often the result of a survey is an indigestible mass of badly interpreted data collected from a poorly chosen, inadequate sample by unreliable and invalid methods according to an ill-conceived design."

Wood outlined the various methods of carrying out use studies and the pitfalls to avoid. He laid particular emphasis on the importance of carrying out pilot studies before beginning the full-scale investigation. This is particularly true in the case of studies conducted by questionnaire.

Chervenie stated that evaluating a catalog from the point of view of the user should determine: (a) "if it can be used effectively, easily, and rapidly with a minimum of staff assistance;" (b) "how much instruction and/or assistance the user needs," (c) "if the documents retrieved . . . are appropriate for the user's needs . ." (d) "how many relevant documents were undetected." Basic problems of methodology involve the reliability of users' memories, the alteration of behavior in subjects under observation, and the validity of the environments created in experimental studies.

Other problems related to the users' behavior in surveys are pointed out by Maltby (36). The user has not usually reasoned out his catalog needs; he does not know what information the catalog can feasibly supply, and he has a tendency to respond affirmatively as to the usefulness of certain catalog items on the theory that he might find such items useful some day, or that others must find them useful.

In 1973, Seymour and Scholfield (49) reported on a survey design to measure reader failure at the catalog. The design was devised by the Library Management Research Unit of the University of Cambridge, and was tested in four libraries. It proposed to determine the rate and cause of failure of known-item searches, and what action readers proposed to take to obtain items not found in the catalog. The method was twofold; to place "Catalogue Query Slips" at the catalog, on which the reader could report his failure, and to conduct brief interviews with a small sample of users at the catalog. The authors concluded that this was a simple system for conveying valuable information to the librarian on reader behavior and needs, and for indicating gaps in the library's collections. Among the results reported was that the biggest problem for undergraduates was surnames, while the research students had more trouble with titles. At Cambridge, the action planned by the largest number of users who failed to find an item was to forget it. A poor second choice was to try another library; a third, to ask a librarian.

In spite of the negative reactions to many library surveys and survey techniques, there is general agreement that more basic research is needed. Krikelas declares that "the identification of the problems of measuring catalog use is, in itself, sufficient justification for having done the catalog use studies." (29)

Subgroup C found a wide variety of methodology used in the surveys it selected for study. Seven were experimental, setting up artifical situations to test certain aspects of catalog use (3,5,15,16,21,30,53). Of the quantitative surveys, seven used a combination of questionnaires and interviews (2,11,12, 19,33,37,48); eight used interviews only (6, 9, 31, 38, 40, 43, 45, 50); three, questionnaires only (1, 35, 51); three, analysis of reference questions (4, 46, 47); one (reported in three articles) a combination of interviews with observation of user behavior (54, 55, 56); and one each, a combination of questionnaires, interviews, and analysis of reference questions (28), a combination of query slips at the catalog and interviews (49) and a tally of sources of call-slip information (39).

Twenty-one of the quantitative surveys were limited to actual users of the catalog, while four included both users and non-users.

D. WHO USES THE CATALOG?

The answer to the question "Who uses the catalog?" (and who does not) is closely connected to the question of how the catalog is used. It has major implications for catalog planning in a large academic library containing materials in virtually every branch of knowledge and with units scattered over a large area. Unfortunately, we find little information on this subject in the literature.

From a large number of user surveys a picture of the "typical" catalog user has emerged--"a young, well-educated person, more often male than female." Usually he is a student. This picture offers little of value for our purposes.

On the ratio between catalog users to the total number of library users there seems to be a consensus. Frarey concluded from his survey of surveys that a library's catalogs are used at some time by about 60 percent of library users nearly twenty years later Maltby came up with almost the identical figure--59 percent. Maltby analyzed the statistics by academic level and type of library. He found that library catalogs are used to some extent by 75-76 percent of college and university library users, but by only 52.5 percent of polytechnic institution library users.

Maltby's findings give some support to other, not very conclusive indications in the literature that there is less catalog use among scientists than among humanists and social scientists.

Stinson's 1966 survey of "Information Gathering Habits of Faculty, Staff and Graduate Students of the Departments of Botany and Zoology of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill" (51) found that the catalog was one of the least useful library aids for this group. In fact, no significant use of the catalog was made by them; when used at all, it was usually as a finding tool. The body of material on which they most heavily depended was periodical literature.

Stinson's findings about scientists cannot be considered definitive. Nor is there available any definitive proof of catalog use by humanists. There are clues, however. Burchard's article, "How Humanists Use a Library," (13) gives an excellent summing up of the nature of this use: the library itself is the humanists laboratory; monographs, complete basic texts, and variant editions are more important than journals; a current document is frequently less important than an earlier one; the production of many disciplines must be examined; the importance of materials cannot be determined by the heaviness of their use; even if the humanist could see every existing monograph, the monographic literature available is full of lacunae.

Kenney's 1966 survey of the Central Library and Documentation Branch of the International Labour Organization in Geneva (28) studied the library use patterns of a certain group of social scientiests. It does not by any means offer a complete study of their catalog use, but it does provide a suggestive picture of basic catalog use by an organization whose members have a vast diversity of interests and whose libraries are scattered over a large area. Among the facts that emerged were that 14 percent of the research people never used any of the catalogs in the system, that 57 percent never used the serial and pamphlet catalogs, because they were ignorant of their existence, and that researchers preferred to make use of more limited documentation at their own annexes rather than go to the central library where more information was available.

Another class of catalog users--the library staff member--is found in most surveys to occupy a unique position. Maltby did not include librarians in his catalog use survey because he found it impossible to devise a questionnaire suitable for both the librarian and the general user. Spalding abandoned the attempt to include the library staff in his study of the use of catalog entries at the Library of Congress. Penalosa and Grose conceded that the librarians' needs were different from the needs of other catalog users. The vast amount of information on the catalog card which may be confusing and useless for the general reader is absolutely essential to the librarian. Penalosa felt that the catalog was designed more for the librarian than for the general public, and suggested a dual cataloging system with bibliographical information to be compiled by catalogers, and annotations to be provided by public service librarians for the general public. One main entry catalog would be established for the library's staff, while another, with less bibliographical detail but indicating the scope and level of the work, would be provided for the public.

One of the assumptions made by the University of Chicago project was that there is a "hidden market" for the use of a research library catalog; a large number of people do not use the catalog because they have inadequate search clues. The suggested solution to this admittedly conjectural situation was to increase redundancy and multiple-access points in the catalog by an enormous amount (53).

E. THE SUBJECT SEARCH

It has long been acknowledged that the subject heading is the most problematic type of heading in the library catalog. It was the topic found most perplexing and insoluable in the UCLA Card Catalog Survey of 1956. It is at the head of Perrine's list of catalog difficulties in university libraries. It remains the most perplexing problem for the investigators who are today making catalog use surveys with computerization of the catalog as their objective.

The difficulties are both practical and theoretical. Subject headings are the most expensive elements of the catalog in terms of cataloging time. With the avowed intention of cutting expenses, Markley (33) and Merritt (39) published surveys in 1950 and 1951 which indicated that subject cataloging could be limited to works in English published in the last ten to twenty-five years with little loss in user convenience and great saving of money. It has been stated that since the needs of the library staff obviate any extensive modification of author or title entries, major changes can only be considered for the subject entry.

Some theoretical studies have reinforced the attack. Swank and others (52) have laughed at the pretensions of the library catalog to be a bibliography, except in the case of a very few outstanding libraries. They have suggested that librarians might better spend their time compiling bibliographies and working out ways to coordinate the use of the catalog with the use of printed bibliographies. Wilson has declared that the library profession has not even decided, in principle, what a subject is (58).

For Margaret Brown's Master's thesis of 1946, "The Use Made of the Subject Catalog by Graduate Students in the Social Sciences," (12) thirty-three students (out of two classes containing 160) were interviewed at the card catalog. For these students the subject catalog was "an unsatisfactory and inefficient instrument." Brown observed that when the student wanted a selective list of the best books on a subject, he found the catalog unselective; when he wanted all the material printed on a given subject, the catalog gave him a list selected on the basis of the books owned by the library. She repeats the "charge" that the subject catalog is of little use to the specialist except when he is not specializing.

In addition to the inadequacies of the catalog itself, students' difficulties were traced to their own inexperience and lack of skill. They had trouble distinguishing between title and subject entries, and in fact, were ignorant of the whole concept of entry. They were unable to use suggestions furnished by the catalog itself, such as see also references and tracings on cards. Impatience was characteristic; the students were discouraged if they found nothing under a subject on the first try, and almost as discouraged if they found many titles listed.

Language was the chief basis for selecting titles, even though much of the most important material was in German. Many students seemed unaware that they were missing material on this basis, while others lamented the lack of translations. The students relied heavily on the book title and on contents notes for selection; they often considered the tracings to be contents notes. Few indicated that the date of the book influenced their choice.

Frarey's summary of users' difficulties with subject headings included: lack of understanding of the rule of specificity; difficulties with obsolete terms and inverted forms; failure to distinguish among subjects, title and corporate entries; inability to cope with long runs of cards under one entry; confusion about geographical and chronological subdivisions.

Diener, in his survey of four theological libraries in the Boston area in 1970 (19), found a far higher percentage of patrons made use of the subject approach at the Boston University School of Theology than at the other libraries, because the catalog was relatively new, and up-to-date in its entries.

Some solid facts about the use of subject headings have emerged from a recent experimental project by Bates (5). In her Doctoral Dissertation of 1972, she tried to determine the effect of "subject familiarity" and "catalog familiarity" on success in subject searches. "Success" has been the most difficult aspect of subject searching to evaluate. Most studies have reported gratifying success figures, ranging from 60 percent to 96 percent! But these evaluations have been based on the circumstance that the reader found something, not on whether it was the best thing, or precisely what the user needed.

Using an experimental technique, with groups of economics, psychology, and library school students, Bates determined that success in subject searches is far more closely related to familiarity with the catalog than to familiarity with the subject. In fact, subject familiarity has a very slight detrimental effect. The library school students tended to err in the direction of being too specific, while the subject specialists tended to select terms that were too broad, or that were different from those used in the catalog. The study revealed a decided difference between true success and assumed success.

Bates was seriously concerned about the whole principle of specific entry, and found it needed further deep study. One factor that affects the user is that the book, not the topic, is the focus; the researcher does not "demand his material in book-size packages." She felt that the low level of provision of see also references, which she attributed to cost motivation, contributed greatly to readers' difficulties. But the heart of the problem is the difference in subject choice between library and reader, and the reader's inability to conceptualize his subject and match it with the terminology in the catalog.

The observation that subject heading use decreases as academic level rises was confirmed by Bates. She agreed with the surmise that this might be due to increasing dissatisfaction with a system not geared to the expert. The expert (including the undergraduate major) should not be badly served; he is the primary client of the university and research library. She suggests providing multiple-level catalogs produced by automation techniques--catalogs geared to different levels of knowledge.

Bates finds no preference among users with regard to subject/place order in headings, but decided preference for the natural, uninverted order in adjective/noun subject headings.

The percentage of users whose primary purpose in using the library catalog is to search for material on a subject has not been well established. Although the early surveys reported by Frarey indicated about fifty-fifty division between known-item and subject searches, this figure had been refined by the time of the ALA survey. Evidence that the user's reliance on the subject search decreases as his academic level rises seems proved by many surveys, although the reasons for this are in dispute. At present, the figure seems to have settled at around 30 percent subject searches among higher academic levels. This figure takes into account Lipetz's discovery that his finding of only 16 percent subject searches changed to 33 percent when interviews revealed concealed subject searches behind many known-item searches. Still to be accounted for is the fact that a number of known-item searches are approached through subject headings, although there are a number of theories. Figures such as those found by Brooks and Kilgour at the Yale Medical Library in 1964 (9) which show subject searches at only 12.8 percent need more analysis.

As Bates has stated, subject catalog use is a significant part of all library catalog use, even in academic and research libraries. Statistics tend to confirm that the greatest amount of material selected by subject is in English and of fairly recent date, but there is not enough qualitative data or analysis associated with these figures to make them practical significance.

F. FORM OF THE CATALOG

1. Book versus Card

The discussion of book versus card catalog, launched at the beginning of this century by the great change-over to the card catalog, seems to be coming full circle. The resurgence of the book catalog around the middle of the century was apparently brought about by the belief that "the reason for the decline of the printed catalog had somehow been overcome by the computer" (3). Librarians assumed that users needed and wanted book catalogs, but these assumptions were never verified by systematic or reliable tests.

The compendium on book catalogs published by Kingery and Tauber in 1963 (28a) outlined the advantages and disavantages of the book catalog, but was chiefly devoted to technological and feasibility studies. Advantages listed were the familiar ones: mobility; the possibility of multiple copies; visual superiority for scanning; ease of compiling bibliographies by photocopying; saving of space; saving of physical exertion; uses as a resource tool for a library system, a region, or separate campus libraries. Most of the disadvantages mentioned had little to do with the user. Those that did apply were: the impossibility of keeping the book catalog up-to-date; the inconveniences of consulting more than one alphabet (where supplements would be involved); the dangers of congestion. The only article that surveyed use, Stevens' report on the use of the Library of Congress Printed Catalog within the Library of Congress itself, concluded that while book catalogs were welcome as additions to complete, up-to-date card catalogs, they were not a substitute, and were not used as such by either the public or the library staff.

An article by Ira Harris published in 1964 (26) pointed out the lack of user evaluation in Kingery and Tauber, and observed that "testimonials" only were given. He added hopefully: "Undoubtedly, as more libraries adopt book catalogs, more will be written about their use." He suggested that user surveys should investigate: how book catalogs are used; in what ways catalog use is facilitated by the book form; how the user likes it; what, in terms of use, the book catalog does that is different; what changes in the patterns of library service the book catalog is likely to encourage.

Unfortunately, when a second compilation on book catalogs appeared in 1971, by Tauber and Feinberg (56a), these questions remained unanswered. Reports on user reaction were all impressionistic. Users were declared to be "delighted", "most favorable", etc., but no proofs were adduced. The report on the book catalog at the University of California at Santa Cruz did observe that most of the negative response stemmed from the fact that the catalog was not up-to-date. Margaret Brown's report on the book catalog of the Free Library of Philadelphia stated that the catalog was a "proven success", and that patrons were "universally delighted", but also said that "habit is strong", and neither staff nor public would use the book catalog when a card catalog was available.

In the final chapter of Tauber and Feinberg, Hines and Jessica Harris stated, "Librarians have only begun to see clearly what we are publishing book catalogs for, and how we can best use this kind of tool. Some existing book catalogs have been produced primarily as bibliographies with possible additional uses as locating devices for interlibrary loans. Others have been produced primarily as finding lists for particular library or library system collections. Still others are intended for both purposes. Some, like the Harvard shelflists, may begin as internal control devices, but turn out to be of superlative value as specialized bibliographies. OUr understanding of the uses of book catalogs, until now at least, seems to lack any theoretical base."

In the article "Author versus Title" (4), Ayres declared that experience with a book form of index and a card index on a card wheel proved that the user found the book form of catalog more acceptable than the card form!

One recent attempt has been made to produce an objective, data-based comparison of the use of book and card catalogs. In connection with the University of Chicago project, Aubry undertook an experimental study, published in 1972 (3), of the time involved in the manual searching of book and card catalogs. A pilot project involved twenty graduate students in searching for sets of itmes in the National Union Catalog and the University of Chicago card catalog. The results of this project, that NUC searching took more time, were discounted because of significant differences other than format between the two catalogs. The principal experiment permitted a clear focus on differences due solely to format. The monographic catalog of the Center for Research Libraries exists in both book and card form. Twenty graduate students were given items to search, and again more time was needed to search the book catalog. Aubry's third experiment, which focussed on the effect of "neighboring item similarity, pertains to the adverse effect of total size on any kind of catalog.

A survey conducted by Sacco in 1973 (48) has limited usefulness for our purpose, because the libraries used (a public library in West Chester, Pennsylvania, and a Junior College library in St. Louis, Missouri) were small and not at a high academic level, and also because no controls were used in the survey for comparison with a card catalog. Nevertheless, some interesting observations emerged. Most user difficulties were of the same type found in surveys of card catalog users. But all searches for periodical failed! St. Louis, which has three book catalogs (author, title and subject) lists periodicals alphabetically at the beginning of the title catalog, while Chester has a completely separate periodical catalog. Another problem with the book catalog, in the author's opinion, was that readers found it more difficult to identify the call number.

Although the great majority of comments on the catalogs were favorable, principal complaints were that the catalogs were confusing, complicated, and difficult, never up-to-date. It was inconvenient to have to look in more than one alphabet. At Chester, a card file is used to up-date the book catalog, and the author mentioned the importance of knowing the date of publication of a book to expedite use of the catalog. Suggested improvements were the addition of hard cover to the catalog volumes in the one library that did not have these, and anchoring in place one complete set of each catalog.

It is apparent that the user study has not been a factor in the choice of book over card catalog. But the time when the book catalog was unreservedly regarded as superior is now over. Maurice Freedman can still assert that "Book catalogs can provide the cheapest, most efficient and timeliest means of access to a library's resources for the greatest number of people." But Krikelas states, "A mere change in the format of the catalog does not guarantee an increase in user performance." (29) And Elrod, in his 1973 review of the Year's Work in Cataloging and Classification, declares, "The giant step backward to book catalogs which sometimes seems to be a part of computerization of the catalog is beginning to be recognized as retrogressive." (22)

2. Dictionary versus Divided

Although the concept of the divided catalog is very old, its modern revival apparently began with an article written by William Fletcher in 1905, in which he advocated the simplification of the ever-growing catalog by the removal of subject entries to a separate file. There was little response to this proposal for thirty years, when it was taken up by Donald Coney of the University of California at Berkeley.

In 1938, Berkeley divided its dictionary card catalog into two separate catalogs--an author/title catalog and a subject catalog. No investigation of the use of these two catalogs was made until 1947, when a survey was made by Markely, published in 1950 (38). A year later, in 1948, another survey of these catalogs was made by Merritt, using a different methodology. This was published in 1951 (39). The purpose of these two surveys was not to evaluate the advantages of the arrangement for the user, but to identify, by amount of use, types of materials for which subject classification could be eliminated. Their findings consequently belong to the category of subject searches, rather than divided catalogs, and are included in the discussion of the former.

Although a considerable body of literature on the subject of divided catalogs was subsequently produced, no study until Krikelas' survey of 1969 (30) attempted to establish a clear relationship between the type of arrangement and the successful use of the catalog. Elrod's experiment in 1962 (21) proved nothing since his results amounted only to expressions of satisfaction from users both before and after the experimental division of the catalog.

Heinritz's article of 1964 (27) investigated only one aspect of the problem: whether or not dividing the catalog relieves congestion. He raised questions to which he had no answers. Previous studies had ignored the complexity of the subject and had provided no quantitative proof that division relieves congestion. Heinritz pointed out that since dividing a catalog inevitably involves some duplication of entries, the total size of the catalog is increased. In his opinion, the arguments regarding the amount of space involved in divided versus dictionary catalog had long been laid to rest, but the question of waiting time for users remained important. He felt the need for more knowledge of pertinent variables as well as a much more rigorous mathematical analysis.

Bookstein tried to provide such an analysis in 1972 (7) in his study produced in connection with the University of Chicago project. He arrived at formulas which could be used to solve the problem of congestion. Using three measurements of congestion: "blocking" (wanted drawer in use), waiting time, and number of people in the catalog area, he found that each might lead to a different conclusion. In a large research library a divided catalog would be preferable in terms of "blocking", and a dictionary catalog in terms of waiting time. He provided a formula which would allow the determination of the number of volumes into which a book catalog should be divided, based on the three elements of congestion. His formulas apply to forms of catalog division other than subject-author, and to other types of library operations.

The Krikelas study is an experimental survey to determine if dividing a traditional dictionary catalog would result in an increase of effectiveness in subject searches. Since many former studies had indicated the user's difficulty in distinguishing subject headings from other types of entries, the assumption was that subject searches would be easier in the divided catalog, where subject headings, through being segregated, are unambiguously identified.

The experiment involved the use of the card catalogs in two large Midwestern state universities of similar size and reputation--one with a dictionary, the other with a divided catalog. The 144 undergraduates who participated were selected at random. A number of these were matched between the two groups by class year, frequency of catalog use, grade-point average, and other characteristics. Grade-point average was the only individual characteristic shown to have any effect on success--a 5 percent differential. Evaluation of "success" was made as objective as possible by assigning pre-tested tasks involving the location of cards bearing predetermined subject headings. A couple of known item searches were included in the experiment as a check.

No significant difference was found in the success rate between the two groups using the two catalogs. The record of performance for the known-item searches was also the same for both.

The largest single cause of failure in the subject searches was use of incorrect search terms (29 percent). Next was the inability to distinguish between subject and other kinds of entries. This difficulty was expected to show up among the users of the dictionary catalog and did so for 23 percent. But for the users of the divided catalog the results were even more enlightening, for 22.8 percent also did not make this distinction! The reason was that they had used the author/title catalog to make subject searches. This in spite of the fact that the two catalogs were separated and clearly marked with signs, different colors were used for drawer labels, and all the students involved had used the library catalog at least once during the current semester.

Krikelas; conclusion was that dividing the catalog does not make subject searches more effective.

In his 1970 survey (19) Diener found that many users of libraries with divided catalogs are unaware that the library has a divided catalog.

The problem of the divided catalog does not relate only to the familiar author/title-subject scheme. Penalosa in 1956 (45) suggested that while the general user was confused by most of the information on the catalog card, the librarian found most of this information indispensable. He suggested two catalogs: a simplified catalog for the public, and an author catalog with complete bibliographical information for use of the librarian.

McGregor in 1971 (34) defended the dictionary catalog, asserting that splitting increases the bulk of the catalog, as redundant cards must be added, and that user confusion grows with each additional catalog as the problem of where to look becomes more puzzling and defeating.

The machine and the computer have made the production of all kinds of catalogs possible. In a semi-humorous article entitled "Why not Both?" published in 1973 (42), Morris suggested that libraries might have not only a dictionary catalog and a divided catalog, but a dictionary catalog plus all kinds of other catalogs: Title Catalog; Author Catalog; Subject Catalog; People Catalog; Places Catalog; and the Corporate Author Catalog (which should be kept strictly away from the patron).

User studies have not yet been made of another type of catalog division: The division by chronological cut-off.

G. SUMMARIES

1. Summary of Conclusions

a. Conclusions on which there is general agreement, corroborated by objective evidence.

I Users

1. Insufficient basic research has been done on the evaluation of existing catalogs and the needs and skills of users.

2. Many or most catalog users do not understand the functions, purposes, contents, or arrangement of the catalog, and cannot interpret the information it contains.

3. The majority of catalog users (in libraries of all kinds) are students, using the catalog in connection with course work and other academic requirements.

4. About 60 percent of all library users use the catalog at some time. In academic libraries, the percentage is higher -- perhaps about 75 percent.

5. Few users are able to supplement the catalog by the use of other bibliographical tools.

6. Catalog users in general show a great dislike for having to look in more than one place or in more than one alphabet.

7. The level of perseverance shown by most users making catalog searches is very low; no more than half will try a second entry after an initial failure.

II. How the catalog is used.

1. The search for "known items" accounts for about half the catalog use in libraries in general. This kind of use increases as the academic level of the user rises, until it reaches about 70 percent in academic libraries. Once the college level is reached, evidence about continuing increase in the percentage of known-item use is conflicting.

2. In known-item searches, the author approach is by far the most frequently used, even when the user has more accurate information about the title.

3. The most frequently consulted information on catalog cards is author, title, subject, call-number, and date. Studies do not agree on the order of importance of these items.

4. About 30 percent of catalog searches in academic libraries are subject searches, some of which are concealed as known-item searches.

5. Library staffs use the catalog in a different way from other types of users. Their need for bibliographical data is greater

than and different from that of other users, and is essential for their work.

III. Difficulties encountered with public catalogs.

1. Catalog size affects ease of use (but to what extent is not known).

2. Basic difficulties in catalog use are:

   a. Filing rules
   b. Subject headings
   c. See and see also structure
   d. Lack of title added entries
   e. Inaccurate information on the part of the patron

3. Subject headings are the most problematic type of heading in the catalog.

4. Users' difficulties with subject entries include:

   a. Lack of understanding of the rule of specific entry.
   b. Inconsistency in the catalog in the application of the rule of specific entry.
   c. Difficulty with inverted forms.
   d. Obsolete terms
   e. Failure to distinguish among subjects, titles and corporate entries.
   f. Confusion about subdivisions of entries.
   g. Confusion about geographical or subject priority in entries
   h. Long runs of cards under one entry.
   i. Inability to conceptualize a subject and match it with catalog terminology.

IV. How the user may be assisted.

1. Having assistance available at the catalog materially increases and improves his use.

2. There is need for more instruction in the use of the catalog, although the most effective means of giving such instruction are not generally agreed upon.

3. There is a strong demand by users for more contents notes on cards, and for annotations which give some indication of the scope or level of the cataloged book.

b. Conclusions on which there is disagreement and in which evidence is conflicting or inefficient.

I. Users

1. Humanists and social scientists use the public catalog more than physical or biological scientists.

2. The catalog needs of the humanist and social scientist differ in kind from the needs of the physical or biological scientist.

3. Previous experience with the catalog of a large library helps in the use of catalogs of other large libraries.

4. The user's knowledge of the title of the book he is seeking is more complete and accurate than his knowledge of the author's name.

II. Type of catalog

1. The advantages to the user of the book over the card catalog have never been objectively demonstrated.

2. The advantages of the divided over the dictionary catalog have never been objectively demonstrated.

3. Subject catalogs are not needed at all, or could be modified to include only books in English of fairly recent date.

III. Success in using the catalog

1. Success in subject searches has never been properly evaluated. A high percentage of success is reported, but there are indications that this often means only that the reader has found something he can use, not necessarily the best material, or what he really needed.

2. Success in known-item searches has not been adequately evaluated, since the user's real objectives are rarely known.

3. Precise knowledge of the book title correlates more closely with success in catalog use than precise knowledge of the author's name.

IV. Function of the catalog

1. As a subject bibliography, the library catalog is generally unsuccessful.

2. Most of the descriptive bibliographical data given on the catalog card are unused and unnecessary.

3. Usability would be improved by chronological filing of subject cards.

4. Neither the author nor the title approach has an overwhelming advantage.

5. Simplistic cataloging by computer would be unsatisfactory.

6. Expansion of the library's collections and better orientation of users would do more to improve success in catalog use than modification or expansion of catalog entries.

2. Summary of Recommendations

a. Recommendations for improving catalogs and their use

I. Provide more assistance to users at the catalog.

II. Provide more and better instruction in the use of the catalog.

III. Provide more access points to the catalog through supplementary indexes, additional title entries, additional title-like entries, analytics, personal name added entries.

IV. Provide more contents notes on cards.

V. Provide more annotations on cards.

VI. Provide more signs and guide cards.

VII. Use fewer abbreviations on catalog cards.

VIII. Provide more see and see also references.

IX. Use normal word order in subject headings.

X. Eliminate obsolete subject headings.

XI. Eliminate long runs of cards under subject headings.

XII. Provide more descriptive annotations as to scope, level, etc., on cards.

XIII. Tie the catalog more closely to the rest of the bibliographic network of the library.

b. Recommendations for further research

I. Who uses the catalog, and why (not just "typical" user).

II. Who does not use the catalog, and why not.

III. Variations in catalog needs of different groups of users (e.g., scientists, humanists, etc.).

IV. Qualitative use of catalog.

V. How the Library staff uses the catalog.

VI. Do we need catalogs at all.

VII. Methods of providing more and better instruction in the use of catalogs for all types of users.

VIII. Specific methods of correlating subject catalogs with subject bibliographies.

IX. Fundamental research on problems of subject headings.

X. Problems of specific entry.

XI. Value of title entries.

XII. Effects of limiting subject catalogs to fairly recent materials in English.

XIII. Relative cost and effectiveness of dictionary versus divided catalog.

XIV. Relative cost and effectiveness of book versus card catalog.

XV. What functions do catalogs serve at present.

XVI. How far does the physical form of the catalog affect its use.

XVII. How much should catalogs be designed for direct use of reader.

XVIII. Solving the problems of cost versus improvements.

XIX. Refinements in methodology of investigating catalog use.

XX. Use of descriptive bibliographic elements on cards.

XXI. Evaluating success in catalog use.

XXII. How far should local standards go in overriding national standards.

XXIII. Should more resources be devoted to reader services and less to cataloging.

XXIV. Can circulation statistics be correlated with catalog use and be used as a reliable index to the latter.

H. GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

After more than forty years of catalog use studies, the needs of the catalog user still remain to be identified. Unfortunately, the Library catalog has been the target of criticism even longer, and the favorite complaint has been that it does not meet the needs of its users. It is too large, complicated, and costly; it is illogical; it was created by catalogers, for catalogers, as their own plaything. The motivating force behind the creation of the user survey was the theory that once the needs of the user were discovered a catalog could be created which would fulfill these needs.

The use surveys have identified the "typical" catalog user, but this is not much help. He turns out to be a student who is using the catalog in connection with some kind of academic assignment, who does not understand the function or arrangement of the catalog and cannot interpret the information it contains, who gives up easily, dislikes looking in more than one place or refuses to do so, and who is usually looking for a specific book under the name of the author in spite of the fact that he has a more exact notion of the title. As the Ayres report puts it: "Card catalogs are normally used with a minimum of intelligence and usually by people of above average intelligence."

The library user who does not use the catalog has not even been identified. He does not know why he does not use it, or refuses to tell. He may prefer to browse at the shelves; he may have other sources of information; he may be a member of that "hidden market" postulated by the University of Chicago project and would use the catalog if only it provided sufficient access points to match his vague and inexact information.

It is known that all users and non-users are not necessarily typical. Some feel that although the expert in a field may use the catalog differently from a novice, he deserves some service. There is a feeling that different kinds of users require different amounts of bibliographical information, but there is little evidence as to whether or not the amount of such information affects a catalog's utility. There are indications of very different library needs and types of catalog use by humanists, social scientists, and natural and applied scientists, but the supporting evidence is scanty. The librarian is admitted to be a very special class of user with special needs, but the importance of catering to these needs has not been agreed upon.

The function of the library catalog has not been determined. Grose (25) and others question the need for a catalog at all and feel we should not proceed until we know where we are going. Chervenie (14) thinks that over the years the catalog has gradually changed from a guide to the library's resources to a guide to its book collections only, and that the user is unaware of this change. If the catalog is a bibliography, it is an unsatisfactory one, unselective as to the best books, selective as to the total amount of material printed. The catalog is a part of the total information network of the library, and the user whould be taught to select and use the information source appropriate to his need.

Although users refuse to look in more than one place, a large body of opinion supports a multiplicity of supplementary catalog indexes of all kinds.

The surveys have identified, from the user's point of view, a number of problems and difficulties with the catalog. The solving and correction of these is possible and would probably be helpful. The subject heading is the thorniest cataloging problem. Some surveys simply ignore it; some suggest abolishing or severely limiting it. Others suggest drastic reform. There probably is a solution to the problem which will emerge in time.

On three points there is general agreement: more surveys of catalog use and users are needed; users need more assistance at the catalog; and users need more and better instruction in the use of the catalog. There is a good deal of evidence that users demand more contents notes on cards. They would also like descriptive annotations telling the scope and level of the cataloged book.

For all its faults, the library catalog is generally regarded as an effective instrument which satisfies, or at least helps, its users more than 70 percent of the time. It is complicated, but as Krikelas has pointed out, it is not equally complicated in all its sections. The user may have difficulty in finding anything under U.S., but he can easily find a book by Ernest Hemingway.

The librarians have had to create the dictionary card catalog out of theory even though, as has been claimed, they have had no general principles to guide them. We are entering the age of computerization with the same lack of guiding principles and the same lack of genuine knowledge of the user and his needs. Perhaps something of significance will have been learned before the new age is in full swing. Perhaps, and more likely, we will again be in the situation of training or failing to train the user to make do with what we have provided him.

1. BIBLIOGRAPHY

This bibliography includes only items in the literature that were considered to be of importance for the survey. Many more items were examined but were not included because they were considered either unimportant or irrelevant to our purposes.

The item number in the bibliography corresponds to the number in parentheses in the report.

*1. Akers, S.G. To What Extent Do the Students of the Liberal Arts Colleges Use the Bibliographical Items Given on the Catalog Card? Library Quarterly 1: 394-408, October 1931.

2. American Library Association. Resources and Technical Services Division. Cataloging and Classification Section. Policy Research Committee. Catalog Use Study. Chicago, American Library Association, 1958.

*3. Aubry, John. A Timing Study of the Manual Searching of Catalogs. Library Quarterly 42: 399-415, October 1972.

*4. Ayres, F.H., et al, Author versus Title: A Comparative Study of the Accuracy of the information which the User Brings to the Library Catalog. Journal of Documentation 24: 266-272, December 1968.

5. Bates, M.J. Factors Affecting Subject Catalog Search Success. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of California (Berkeley) School of Librarianship, 1972.

6. Blackburn, Mary. Information About Books Known by Users of the Catalog Who Are Looking for a Particular Work. Unpublished Master's Dissertation, University of Chicago Graduate Library School, 1968.

*7. Bookstein, Abraham. Congestion at Card and Book Catalogs--A Queuing-Theory Approach. Library Quarterly 42: 316-328, July 1972.

*8. Brodman, Estelle and Doris Bolef. Printed Catalogs: Retrospect and Prospect. Special Libraries 59: 783-788, December 1968.

9. Brooks, Benedict and F. G. Kilgour. Catalog Subject Searches in the Yale Medical Library. College and Research Libraries 25: 483-487, November 1964.

10. Brown, Margaret C. A Book Catalog at Work. Library Resources and Technical Services 8: 349-358, Fall 1964.

*11. Brown, Margaret C. The Graduate Student's Use of the Subject Catalog. College and Research Libraries 8: 203-208, July 1947.

12. Brown, Margaret C. The Use Made of the Subject Catalog by Graduate Students in the Social Sciences. Unpublished Master's Dissertation, University of Chicago Graduate Library School, 1946.

*13. Burchard, J.E. How Humanists Use a Library. *In* Planning Conference on Information Transfer Experiments. *INTREX*. Boston, M.I.T. Press, 1965, pp. 219-233.

*14. Chervenie, Paul. Library Catalogs in American Academic Libraries. *Drexel Library Quarterly* 7:56-64, January 1971.

15. Chicago. University Graduate Library School. *Requirements Study for Future Catalogs*. Progress Report No. [illegible], 1968.

*16. Cooper, W.S. The Potential Usefulness of Catalog Access Points Other Than Author, Title and Subject. *Journal of the American Society for Information Sciences* 21:112-126, March-April 1970.

17. Davis, R.A. and C.A. Bailey. *Bibliography of Use Studies*. Philadelphia, Drexel Institute of Technology, Graduate School of Library Science, 1964.

18. De Weese, L.C. *A Bibliography of Library Use Studies*. *In* Jain, A. K. and De Weese, L.C. *A Statistical Study of Book Use*. Lafayette, Ind., Purdue University, 1967.

*19. Diener, R.E., *et al*. Catalog Use Study. *Religious and Theological Resources* 1:115-122, April 1970.

*20. Dubester, H.J. Studies Related to Catalog Problems. *Library Quarterly* 34:97-105, January 1964.

*21. Elrod, J. McRee. The Divided Catalog. *Library Journal* 87:1728-1730, May 1962.

*22. Elrod, J. McRee. Year's Work in Cataloging and Classification. *Library Resources and Technical Services* 17:175-200, Spring 1973.

*23. Ford, Geoffrey. Research in User Behaviour in University Libraries. *Journal of Documentation* 29:85-106, March 1973.

*24. Frarey, C.J. Studies of Use of the Subject Catalog: Summary and Evaluation. *In* Tauber, M.F. *The Subject Analysis of Library Materials*. New York, Columbia University School of Library Service, 1953. pp. 147-166.

*25. Grose, M.W. and M.B. Line. On the Construction and Care of White Elephants; Some Fundamental Questions Concerning the Catalogue. *Library Association Record* 70:2-5, 1968.

26. Harris, Ira. Reader Services Aspects of Book Catalogs. *Library Resources and Technical Services* 8:391-398, Fall 1964.

*27. Heinritz, Fred. Does Dividing the Catalog Relieve Congestion? *Library Resources and Technical Services* 8:310-316, Summer 1964.

*28. Kenney, Laraine. The Implications of the Needs of Users for the Design of a Catalogue: A Survey at the International Labour Office. *Journal of Documentation* 22:195-202, September 1966.

28a. Kingery, R.E. and M.F. Tauber, eds. Book Catalogs. New York, Scarecrow Press, 1963.

*29. Krikelas, James. Catalog Use Studies and Their Implications. In Voight, M.J., ed. Advances in Librarianship: 3. New York, Seminar Press, 1972. pp. 195-220.

*30. Krikelas, James. Subject Searches Using Two Catalogs: A Comparative Evaluation. College and Research Libraries 30:506-517, November 1969.

31. Leonard, L.E., et al. Centralized Book Processing. Metuchen, N.J., Scarecrow Press, 1969.

32. Line, M.B. Library Surveys: An Introduction to Their Use, Planning, Procedure, and Presentation. Melbourne, Cheshire, 1967.

33. Lipetz, B.A. User Requirements in Identifying Desired Works in a Large Library. New Haven, Yale University Library, 1970.

34. MacGregor, J.W. In Defense of the Dictionary Catalog. Library Resources and Technical Services 15:28-33, Winter 1971.

35. Maltby, Arthur and A. Duxbury. Description and Annotation in Catalogues: Reader Requirements. New Library World 73:260-262, April 1972.

*36. Maltby, Arthur. Measuring Catalogue Utility. Journal of Librarianship 3:180-189, July 1971.

*37. Maltby, Arthur. U.K. Catalogue Use Survey. London, Library Association, 1973.

*38. Markley, A.E. University of California Subject Cataloging Inquiry: A Survey of the Subject Catalog Based on Interviews with Users. Journal of Cataloging and Classification 6:88-95, Fall 1950.

39. Merritt, L.C. The Use of the Subject Catalog in the University of California Library. (University of California Publications in Librarianship, Vol. 1, No. 1), Berkeley, University of California Press, 1951.

*40. Miller, R.A. On the Use of the Card Catalog. Library Quarterly 12: 629-637, July 1942.

41. Montague, Eleanor. Card Catalog Use Studies, 1949-65. Unpublished Master's Dissertation, University of Chicago Graduate Library School, 1967.

*42. Morris, L.R. Why Not Both? A Dictionary Catalog and a Divided Catalog. Library Resources and Technical Services 17:25-27, Winter 1973.

*43. Munson, F.L. The Use of the Depository Catalog in a University Library. College and Research Libraries 8:151-156, April 1947.

44. Palmer, R.P. Computerizing the Card Catalog in the University Library; A Survey of User Requirements. (Research Studies in Library Science, No. 6), Littleton, Colo., Libraries Unlimited, 1972.

*45. Penalosa, Fernando. The Card Catalog: A Failure in Communication. *College and Research Libraries* 17:483-485, November 1956.

*46. Perrine, R.H. Catalog Use Difficulties. *R.Q.* 7:169-174, Summer 1967.

*47. Perrine, R. H. Catalog Use Study; the Imperfect Key. *R.Q.* 6:115-119, Spring 1966.

48. Sacco, C.N. Book Catalog Use Study. *R.Q.* 12:259-266, Spring 1973.

*49. Seymour, C.A. and J.L. Scholfield. Measuring Reader Failure at the Catalogue. *Library Resources and Technical Services* 17:6-24, Winter 1973.

*50. Spalding, C.S. The Use of Catalog Entries at the Library of Congress. *Journal of Cataloging and Classification* 6:95-100, Fall 1950.

51. Stinson, M.B. *Information Gathering Habits of the Faculty, Staff and Graduate Students of the Departments of Botany and Zoology at Chapel Hill.* Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of North Carolina, 1966.

*52. Swank, Raymond. Subject Catalogs; Classifications or Bibliographies? A Review of Critical Discussions 1876-1942. *Library Quarterly* 14:316-332, October 1944.

*53. Swanson, D.R. Requirements Study for Future Catalogs. *Library Quarterly* 43:302-315, July 1972.

*54. Tagliacozzo, Renata, *et al*. Access and Recognition: From Users' Data to Catalogue Entries. *Journal of Documentation* 26:230-249, Sept. 1970.

*55. Tagliacozzo, Renata and M. Kochen. Information-Seeking Behavior of Catalog Users. *Information Storage and Retrieval* 6:363-381, 1970.

*56. Tagliacozzo, Renata, *et al*. Orthographic Error Patterns of Author Names in Catalog Searches. *Journal of Library Automation* 3:93-101, June 1970.

56a. Tauber, M.F. and Hilda Feinberg. *Book Catalogs*. Metuchen, N. J., Scarecrow Press, 1971.

*57. Tauber, M.F. Survey Method in Approaching Library Problems. *Library Trends* 13:15-30, 1965.

58. Wilson, Patrick. *Two Kinds of Power: An Essay on Bibliographic Control*. (University of California Publications in Librarianship, Vol. 5), Berkeley, University of California Press, 1968.

*59. Wood, D.N. Discovering the User and His Information Needs. *Aslib Proceedings* 21:262-270, July 1969.

*These items are on file in the Administrative Office.

II. INTERVIEWS

A. Unit Interviews

Subgroup C members interviewed representatives of the various library units regarding use of public catalogs by staff and patrons. Interviews were designed to allow the maximum latitude of response and followed a loosely-constructed format that concentrated on the following points:

1) Who uses public catalogs and for what purposes;
2) The degree to which existing catalogs fulfill requirements of staff and patrons;
3) Who assists patrons and, if necessary, staff with public catalogs;
4) Methods used to orient patrons to catalogs;
5) How catalogs could be made more useful and comprehensible;
6) Opinions of the usefulness of other types of catalogs.

A letter (copies of which have already been distributed to all members of the Working Group) was sent to each unit head in advance. The letter stated the topics to be covered and invited the unit head to include, at his discretion, other members of the unit in the interview. This device appears to have been effective; most interviews included several staff members, sometimes five or more, and in all more than fifty individuals participated.

All library units were interviewed except the English Reading Room and the University Elementary School Library, neither of which is represented in the URL catalogs. Chemistry, Geology/Geophysics, and Physics Libraries were interviewed as a group but, where appropriate, treated as separate units in tabulation. Two members of the Bibliographers Group were interviewed separately.

The Systems Department proved to be the only unit that apparently does not provide assistance to library patrons using public catalogs. With this exception, all units were thus able from direct experience to offer valuable insights into the library user's needs as well as their own internal requirements of public catalogs.

General Observations Derived From Unit Interviews

Because interviews tended to stress problem areas, the long lists of difficulties and of suggestions for improvement that follow in these pages may seem to indicate widespread dissatisfaction with present public catalogs. It should, therefore, be emphasized that most units are reasonably well satisfied with their catalogs and that in the others dissatisfaction centers on specific problem areas.

The Architecture and Urban Planning Library does consider its public catalog to be in poor condition at this time and relies upon the URL catalogs for most purposes. The Law Library feels that the nature of its collection makes formulation of a satsifactory catalog difficult; this unit also notes that heaviest use is made of sets, compilations of laws, and periodicals which are shelved in the reading room and are usually found without the aid of the catalog, and that most of its users prefer to ask for desired items rather than consult any catalog. Public Affairs Service and Map Library emphasized that use of their catalogs is almost always through a staff member rather than directly by the patron; Engineering and Mathematical Sciences Library also remarked that a large percentage of its catalog use is by staff searching on the user's behalf. The Education and Psychology Library is satisfied with its catalogs but not with the amount of assistance it is able to give to users. The Biomedical Library is very well pleased with its catalogs.

Several non-self-cataloging units stated that better communication with Technical Services would improve the effectiveness of their catalogs, and one unit felt that its needs could be met more fully if it became self-cataloging.

The University Research Library's card catalog was discussed at some length by both URL and non-URL units. This catalog seems generally viewed as having certain shortcomings as a tool for the library patron. A major complicating factor is its function as a union catalog for the UCLA Library system; branch holdings are represented, but not by full sets of cards providing multiple approaches (notably by subject), and policies governing branch representation have changed over the years. Cards supplied by self-cataloging units are quite often inconsistent with those produced by Technical Services, and coordination with LC copy is also a continuing problem.

In addition, holdings information for serials, and especially newspapers, is often incomplete, obsolete, and incorrect. Older cards may differ notably from newer ones in the way items of information such as location are recorded, and many cards bear obsolete location information. Because internal uses of the catalog frequently make it convenient to include certain elements of information, the card catalog contains much information that is irrelevant or, worse, confusing for Library users: CLU or catalogers' initials on the face of the card, blind references for headings not in current use, and the like.

Representation of materials given temporary or limited cataloging injects yet another source of perplexity for users, both in the unfamiliarity of the many kinds of cards required and in the inconsistencies of heading, and thus of filing, that result. Still further, many categories such as non-book materials are not represented at all, and users may be unaware of the supplementary catalogs which list so many of the more current items. All of these elements flaw the URL card catalog from the standpoint of user satisfaction and may also cause difficulties for library staff.

It was, however, noted by a number of units that the URL card catalog is a remarkably effective tool representing a very complex collection. One reason for effectiveness is best summarized by the Task Force's statement that the comprehensiveness of both collection and catalog make it likely that the user will find something approximating what he seeks, and that this comprehensiveness also gives the user confidence that a diligent search will be rewarded. As remarked by a Bibliographer, "The catalog does not fail; the collection fails" if a user is unsuccessful in finding relevant materials.

The picture of the patron's catalog requirements that can be gained from even such a broad representation of library staff opinion is necessarily partial, since it depends so much on observation of patrons who have sought assistance. Still, certain recurring comments may serve to identify some basic characteristics of the user/public catalog interface.

In general, the opinion is that the size of a catalog, however forbidding, does, especially in such cumbersome areas as U.S. and Bible entries or lengthy subject sequences with many subdivisions. Familiarity with other catalogs may be an advantage to the user, but not always. The user may assume that a dictionary catalog is divided, or vice versa. He may expect a catalog to contain information which is, in fact, excluded, or be unaware that the catalog contains items he expects to find recorded separately. If there are supplementary catalogs, the patron may be unaware of them, or unwilling to use them or fail to understand their function in the total catalog structure. These factors support the often-repeated assertion that providing direct assistance at catalogs is the most important single method of making them satisfactory for the user.

A number of units, including Ed./Psych., EMS, Law, Music, and Oriental, stated that they would like surveys of use in their own units. A survey is currently being carried out in Biomedical Library by SLS students. Art Library suggested controlled surveys of specific units, made by personnel experienced in the unit and in the unit's field of specialization, and special surveys concentrating on specific points (e.g., use of the Catalog Supplement). Circulation Department noted that a survey of the URL catalog should include extensive questioning of veteran users, and the Task Force emphasized that a URL survey should be done by experts who understand the techniques of framing questions. There is no doubt that a URL survey would require considerable staff time and funding. In general, opinion seemed to favor limited surveys on special aspects of public catalogs and surveys of use in individual units over a full-scale user survey.

WHO USES PUBLIC CATALOGS, AND WHY?

1. Who are library patrons?

   a. Statistics on record:
   URL exit and reference statistics and College exist and reference statistics, taken during February and March, 1973: preliminary tabulation attached. (See pp. 57a-57d)

   Statistics taken in EMS during the same period are being tabulated.

   Statistics from other units are frequently contained in their annual reports.

   Biomedical Library is currently conducting a study. Several other units have indicated willingness to consider surveys if needed.

   b. Additional or supplementary estimates obtained in unit interviews:
   AUP: Almost entirely UCLA students.
   Art: Staff, faculty, UCLA students and off-campus, no percentage estimates.

Biomed: Medical School students and staff, all state colleges in area; outside users, not so many, but use intensively (e.g., film and TV people).

Chem: UCLA faculty and students, primarily.

Clark: 75% UCLA: 2/3 faculty, 1/3 graduate, few undergraduates (usually one-time users); 25% outside: primarily UC and CSU faculty and graduates, visiting scholars.

College: Mostly UCLA students (generally undergraduates); other college students; high school students; increasing number of older people.

Ed/Psych: Mostly graduates; half as many undergraduates; 1/4 academic, 1/4 other.

EMS: Faculty and RA, departmental secretaries, librarians, UCLA graduate and undergraduates; off-campus. (Former head estimates catalog use to be 50% staff, 30% UCLA faculty and students, 20% off-campus).

Law: 3/4 UCLA students. Ca. 1/4 students from other law schools. (Extrapolated from circulation figures). Small number of practicing lawyers in community.

Geology: Faculty, students, heavy off-campus use.

Map: UCLA: 50% undergraduate, 50% graduate. Very large number of off-campus.

GSM C. 600 MBA students, c. 200 Ph.D candidates in Management, Economics, History, Political Science; c. 100 MSc students. Some use from students interested in computer studies (especially SLS), arts management, etc. Considerable outside use, especially related to Extension courses.

Music: Mostly UCLA faculty and students. Some other college students, little other.

Oriental: Faculty, students and other outside users interested in the collection.

Physics: Ranked (1) graduates; (2) faculty; (3) industrial researchers; (4) undergraduates. Proportions of users not estimated. 90% of catalog use is through staff intermediary.

Theater Art: Many off-campus users.

2. Patrons' PURPOSES in using public catalogs:

By far the most frequent purpose is to locate needed books and serials (including holdings of older as well as current serials). There is also some use for other purposes, such as obtaining bibliographical information. Reasons for searches include class assignments, term and seminar papers, thesis and dissertation research, and other research, in proportions commensurate with the user's academic level - undergraduate, graduate, or faculty. Non-UCLA students are more likely to be working on research projects than class assignments. Personal interest accounts for a substantial portion--perhaps as much as one-third--of catalog use.

Special aspects of use in certain units were also noted in unit interviews:

AUP: Most searches are for current materials.

Clark: Heaviest use is for research on authors, periods, and other special areas in which collections are strong. Catalog use to obtain bibliographical information is considerably heavier than in most units.

College: Heaviest use is for class assignments and term papers (undergraduate).

Law: UCLA students use the library primarily to find case studies and for class assignments. Non-UCLA patrons use the library as a whole more as a research collection.

Music: Most searches are to locate books and scores. Currency is not a factor, and the entire chronological range is used.

Special Collections: Searches are for works and types of works peculiar to the unit.

Theater Arts: Most searches are for special materials held in the unit, e.g., clippings, stills, screenplays.

3. Patrons' APPROACHES to public catalogs:

URL: The consensus of units is that most searches are for known items. Subject searches are made more by undergraduates.

Patron approaches reported by other units essentially match the URL consensus, with the following exceptions and additional remarks:

AUP: Searches are for very specific items: commission reports, conferences, etc., or for materials in vertical files.

Clark: In addition to known items, users may be searching for all works by an author or within a period. Many special lists and files are used to find commendatory verses and prefaces, publications of a printer, provenance of items, etc.

College: Subject is the approach most used by undergraduates (though this may be only apparent because help may be asked more frequently for subject searches).

Ed/Psych: Subject approach is frequently used, as is author. Users are seldom aware of titles.

EMS: In contrast to the URL consensus graduates are more likely to use the subject approach here, whereas undergrads are usually after specific items. Faculty are also following specific references. Industrial and other off-campus users are after specific journal articles, conference reports, etc., to xerox.

Law: Most total library use is of sets of cases, laws, and periodicals shelved in the reading room and not requiring use of catalogs to locate. Most catalog searches are for specific books, a minority by subject.

Map: Patrons use catalogs always with the assistance of a staff member.

GSM: In addition to usual use, the separate catalog of reserve books is frequently consulted.

Music: Searches are usually for specific items; editions are seldom important, and as much use is made of older as of new materials.

Oriental: Author-title approach.

Chemistry: Searches are rarely by subject, often for very obscure items; conference proceedings are often sought.

Physics: Most searches are for known items.

PAS: Catalog is not in the usual sense public; 90% of searches are made by staff member for the patron, though patrons may consult trays directly if they wish. Searches are for known items or publications of an agency; subjects are not represented in the catalog.

Special Collections: Searches are usually for a known item, sometimes for types of works (e.g., "shape" books or non-book materials).

Theater Arts: All approaches used; frequent approach by subject or type of work (e.g., motion picture stills).

4. Staff use of public catalogs:

Public catalogs used by Library staff:

1) Unit's own catalogs

All units reported heavy staff use; AUP, whose catalog is currently in poor condition, relies on URL public catalogs for most purposes.

2) URL card catalog

- a) Use heavily: Bibliographers, Circulation, Reference, Serials, College, Task Force, Art, AUP, Technical Services, Special Collections.
- b) Use some: Clark, Law, GSM, Music, PAS, Theater Arts.
- c) Use little or none: Systems, Biomedical, Ed/Psych, EMS, Oriental, Physical Sciences Libraries.

3) UCLA book catalog (Note: This information was not volunteered by all units)

- a) Use heavily: College, Clark, EMS, Law.
- b) Use some: GSM
- c) Use little or none: Bibliographers, Reference, Serials, Systems, Task Force, Art, AUP, Ed/Psych, Music, PAS, Special Collections.

4) Catalog supplement(s) (Note: This information was not volunteered by all units)

- a) Use heavily: Bibliographers, Circulation, Reference, Task Force, Technical Services (Acquisitions and G & E sections), Art, AUP[1], College[2], Ed/Psych[3], EMS[4], Law[5], GSM[6], Music[7].
- b) Use some: PAS, Physical Science Libraries[8].
- c) Use little or none: Serials, Systems, Technical Services (cataloging section[9]), Biomedical, Clark.

Notes:

1. AUP has small Cat. Sup. of own holdings.
2. College has next to latest whole Cat. Sup. and separate NBS listings.
3. Ed/Psych has copy.
4. EMS has own copy.
5. Law has Cat. Sup. of own holdings.
6. GSM has older copy of full Cat. Sup.
7. Music has Cat. Sup. of own holdings.
8. Physical Sciences branches of own holdings.
9. TSD cataloging section cannot use Cat. Sup. as authority file.

5. Library staff may use public catalogs to obtain the following information:

1). Holdings of known items
  a) Location of copy in unit
  b) Location of copies in other units
  c) Edition(s) held
  d) Volumes of serial or work in parts held
  e) Translations held
  f) Number of copies held

2). Holdings of classes of items
  a) Of subject
  b) Of personal author
  c) Of agency or other corporate body
  d) Of conference proceedings, symposia, etc.
  e) Of non-book materials (e.g., pictures).

3). Bibliographical information
  a) Establish main entry
  b) Establish form of author name
  c) Establish full title/subtitle of item
  d) Names of co-authors, editors, translators, or printers
  e) Publication information: place, publisher, date
  f) Series notes
  g) Collation information: size, pagination, etc.
  h) Notes on relationship to other works (e.g., former or merged title, volume of trilogy, etc.)
  i) Contents of collections (of poetry, plays, selected works of author, e.g.)
  j) Identify works containing bibliographies, illustrations, etc.
  k) Serial publication information (e.g., date of first volume, change of editor)
  l) Miscellaneous descriptive information (e.g., limited edition, publication history of set)

4). Miscellaneous information
  a) Tracings on card of known item to determine subject headings for similar works
  b) Check classification assigned to known item or subjects
  c) Establish author dates
  d) Establish binding units of serials
  e) Series analytic to discover series information
  f) "Information cards" (e.g., to indicate existence and location of collections of manuscripts or uncataloged government publications)
  g) Notes on organizations, agencies, countries, etc., contained in "history cards"
  h) Title transliteration
  i) LC card number, Dewey classification, etc., contained on LC printed cards

5). Units may maintain special catalogs, lists, types of cards, or annotations to provide approaches by, for example:
  a) Language of work

    b) Place of publication
    c) Physical form (e.g., "shape" books)
    d) Class of material (e.g., maps)
    e) Association with authors of interest (e.g., prefaces, dedicatory verses, etc.)

6. Library Operations involving use of public catalogs (includes patron assistance):

    1). Reference/reader assistance
        a) Holdings information needed by patrons (in person, by telephone, or by mail)
        b) Bibliographical and miscellaneous information needed by patrons
        c) Finding materials needed to answer reference or informational questions

    2). Acquisitions
        a) Holdings information, including locations and editions
        b) Establish main entry, bibliographical information, etc.

    3). Collection development
        a) Holdings (of known item, subject, personal or corporate author, or type)
        b) Establish main entry, bibliographical information, etc.
        c) Survey collection

    4). Cataloging
        a) Holdings, including editions and locations
        b) Establish main entries, form of author name, bibliographical information, etc.
        c) Establish subject headings
        d) Establish classification
        e) Policy decisions (making guide cards, analytics, handling of serials, see references, decision to give voluminous author handling, etc.)
        f) Maintenance and editing of catalog (filing, surveying for internal consistency, etc.)

    5). Circulation
        a) Locate items needed for reserve
        b) Information for overdue notices, replacements, survey of stack collection, etc.

    6). Interlibrary loan (borrowing and lending)
        a) Holdings, editions, etc.
        b) Establish main entry, bibliographical information, etc.

    7). Gifts and exchange
        a) Holdings, editions, etc.
        b) Establish main entry, bibliographical information, etc.

    8). Serials records
        a) Holdings, editions, volumes bound, etc.

    b) Establish entry, bibliographical information, etc.
    c) Determine binding units
    d) Maintain serial records: adding records of bound volumes, etc.

9). Administration, research, and publication
    a) Holdings, editions, etc.
    b) Bibliographical information
    c) Finding materials needed to accomplish task

Any function may be carried on by any unit in proportion to the unit's activities and special requirements.

ASSISTANCE TO PATRONS (AND, IF NECESSARY, STAFF) WITH PUBLIC CATALOGS

On one point there is almost universal agreement: direct assistance with public catalogs should be provided to patrons. Several units stressed this as the most important single factor in satisfying user requirements, and no dissenting opinion was voiced.

Two units noted that they currently provided full personal assistance at all times, since their catalogs are almost always used by patrons through the intermediary of a staff member (Map and PAS). A third (Clark) remarked that all patrons are admitted to the library by a staff member who automatically offers assistance to inexperienced users. Several units felt that they would provide adequate assistance. Several other units stated that they would provide more direct assistance if they had staff to do so. Several specialized science libraries remarked that in their disciplines catalogs are less important than abstracting services and that catalog assistance in their units is thus not so vital.

Both URL and other library units were also united in the opinion that the URL card catalog should have staff on the spot to provide user assistance. Several units spoke very favorably of the Task Force's recent contributions in this regard. Recommendations for staffing a card catalog service point were made by some units; these were divided between Reference staff, Technical Services staff, or a combination of the two, but there was general agreement that staff should be experienced career personnel and that provision for such staffing should have high priority.

It was also emphasized that a direct telephone line to the URL card catalog would be a boon to other library units and to individual users. At least two units laid special stress on this point.

All units except Systems reported giving assistance to patrons with public catalogs, and that any staff on hand may be called upon to do so. Assistance given at public service points is, of course, to be expected, but any staff may be asked for help at the catalogs. In addition, Bibliographers are often sought out as sources of assistance, and many technical services staff members are often called upon in connection with special problems. Assistance with the use of the public catalogs is thus shown to be a total library endeavor.

ORIENTATION

a) Signs

Most units have a minimal number of signs at public catalogs, usually restricted to section labels and brief general directions. Effectiveness was generally rated as poor to fair, and it was frequently noted that signs are not sufficiently conspicuous. There were, nevertheless, several recommendations for more signs, and particularly for more visible signs.

b) Maps and plans

About half of the library units have maps or similar guides to the physical arrangement of the unit. Effectiveness is gnerally judged to be fair to good.

c) Other visual aids

Special displays, such as the flowchart posted at the College Library's public catalog, were considered fairly effective. There were several suggestions that instructions for use be posted in public catalogs, and that copies of filing rules be made available to users in the catalog.

d) Library Guides and other printed handouts

The UCLA Library Guide, available in all units, was generally rated as poor or ineffective as a means of orienting patrons to the card catalog, since little relevant information is contained in it. Several units reported somewhat better results from their own special guides and information sheets although it was generally noted that printed handouts tend to remain unread. Issuance of special guides and bibliographies was recommended by several units, and a representative of the Bibliographers Group considered highly desirable a series of printed lessons on the URL card catalog.

e) Tours

It was noted that tours are quite effective but not on a broad scale, since they reach relatively few users. Two units expressed satisfaction with self-guided tours that they currently use.

f) Seminars and other special instruction

These were considered quite effective for the few they reach, since they are usually given to users who are at the point of applying what they have learned, and focus is on specific areas.

g) Formal instruction

In at least six interviews it was stated that students should be offered courses in library use that would include catalog use instruction, or that such instruction should be incorporated into courses such as Subject A. Opinions that such courses should be required of all freshmen were somewhat contradicted by the observation that instruction is often given too early in the student's career, so that he forgets it before he has intensive need of the knowledge imparted. It was noted that the College Library's library skills program is popular and well-received but available only to specific classes at this time. Some form of audiovisual instruction was mentioned as desirable in several interviews.

Summary:
The consensus seems to be that all possible forms of orientation should be explored and utilized, and that none can be relied upon as universally effective. It was also noted that some orientation can be incorporated into the catalogs themselves in the form of more guide cards, colored or specially marked cards, and color coding. By far the most effective means of orientation, it was agreed, is personal assistance with public catalogs, and a number of units stated that the form of orientation they most wish to add or expand is this sort of direct assistance.

DIFFICULTIES ENCOUNTERED WITH PUBLIC CATALOGS (with notes on times mentioned)

a) Entry (total 152)
- Main entry (total 56)
  - Corporate (especially subdivisions) (9)
  - Conference and symposia standard entries (2)
  - Form entry for newspapers (11)
  - Title (distintive title entry/principles of choice) (2)
  - Entries for materials at different levels of cataloging (subtotal 24)
    - General (2)
    - Brieflisting - many inaccuracies (11)
    - PATE - many inaccuracies (4)
    - Collections specially treated (e.g., Ganz, Boyer) (7)
  - "Temporarily" withdrawn cards (6)
  - Grammatical form of entry differs from citation (esp. German) (1)
  - LC coordination had to keep up (1)
- Added entries
  - More needed (11)
- Subject headings
  - Principle not grasped by users (9)
  - Obsolete, not sufficiently current (10)
  - Non-specific (14)
  - Large, general (e.g., Political Science) (8)
  - Sub-headings (subtotal 24)
    - Unnecessary (e.g., addresses, essays, lectures) (5)
    - Hard to find (e.g., geographic at end of long series of undivided subject)
    - Confusing (e.g., chronological) (9)
    - Periodicals sub-headings inadequate (1)
    - Inconsistencies (subtotal 14)
      - Books on same subject under different headings (5)
      - Differences between URL and other libraries on campus (9)
    - Branch subjec headings not in URL catalog (8)
    - Unsuitable to purposes of library (following LC does not jibe with UCLA needs) (2)

b) Series (total 28)
- Cat. as sep. (total 10)
  - SNU (subtotal 8)
    - Used too frequently (5)
    - Used inconsistently (3)
  - SAE
    - Arrangement by author, but should be by number (if author known, book can be found by author in usual way) (2)
- Cat. as series (subtotal 18)
  - Open date (5)
  - Beginning date of publication as shown on main card confused with holdings (4)
  - Separate holdings cards (3)
  - Difficulty in distinguishing newspaper from journal (4)
  - Newspaper holdings incorrect and incomplete (2)

c) Cross References (total 34)
  - See and see also (more needed, for subjects, authors, corporate entries) (17)
  - Serial titles (insufficient references from alternate forms of title) (7)
  - Blind references (obsolete or for entries not yet in use) [illegible]
  - Library of Congress printed reference (typographical c[illegible]usion) (1)

d) Analytics
  - More needed (11)

e) Filing (total 98)
- Voluminous authors (subtotal 12)
  - Unified titles needed (4)
  - Need original title on card for translation (3)
  - Inconsistent policies on treating author as voluminous (2)
  - Generally complex and confusing
- Misfiling (6)
- Filing rules (subtotal 23)
  - Rules, complicated, labyrinthine, constantly changing (8)
  - Unit has no written rules (5)
  - Unit's rules differ from URL (4)
  - Differences from other types of filing (in standard bibliographies or other familiar sequences, such as telephone books) (6)
- Abbreviations (5)
- Acronyms (5)
- Transliteration not standardized (3)
- Compound surnames and forenames (2)
  - Initials after surname (1)
  - First names by status (saints, monarchs, etc.) (2)
- Subject headings - subdivisions, inconsistencies (3)
- Corporate entry subdivisions (10)
- Titles and subjects confused (5)
- Musical scores mixed with composers' other writings (1)

Chronological filing of historical periods (5)
Filing by word that does not appear on card (e.g., London (England)) (3)
Filing by title under added entries (except SAE) (3)
Diaritical marks (3)
Bible (3)
Classified filing of subject headings (in units which do this) (3)

f) Special Markings on Cards (total 44)
Location (subtotal 18)
    Branch (5)
    Obsolete (e.g., IIR) (5)
    Inaccurate (e.g., "Newspaper stacks" on cards for microfilmed newspapers) (8)
    Additional copies of editions listed only under main entry (3)
Symbols (subtotal 26)
    Obsolete (e.g., rectangle for Special Collections) (7)
    CLU (5)
    Cataloger's initials (4)
    Other obsolete markings (e.g., "restricted use") (5)
    Call number on back of card (4)
    Irrelevant material from user standpoint (e.g., LC card number) (1)

g) Unreadable Cards (8)
    Photographed title pages (5)
    Unreadable numbers on brieflisting cards (3)

h) Multiple Catalogs (6)

i) Library Materials not Represented in Catalog (total 20)
    Non-book materials (5)
    Branch library holdings (8)
    Delayed in processing (especially materials long-delayed, such as addeds, temporary cards left for years, non-current serials left in contins.) (7)

SUGGESTED WAYS TO MAKE PUBLIC CATALOGS MORE USEABLE

A. Organization
1. Physical Aspects
    More color coding of catalog trays (1)
    Locate closer to service desks (1)
2. Organization of Contents
    Unify catalogs to reduce number of places to look (3)
    Change from dictionary to divided catalog (2)
    Do not divide catalog (2)
    Use telephone book filing (1)

B. Contents and Scope
1. Representation of Materials in URL Public Catalog

Remove serials from card catalog (5)
Remove newspapers from card catalog (4)
Represent non-book holdings (2)
Remove cards for lost or withdrawn books (1)

2. Entries in URL Public Catalog
    - Full cataloging or more added entries for branch holdings in URL catalog (8)
    - More analytics (5)
    - More see and see also references (5)
    - More guide cards (4)
    - More specific subject headings (4)
    - More current subject headings (4)
    - Better information on items in process (2)
    - See also references for geographical subdivisions of subject headings (1)
    - Guide cards for alternate spellings of surnames (1)
    - Eliminate unnecessary subject subdivisions or subheadings (1)
    - Put cataloging information into machine-readable form (1)
3. Representation of Materials in Other Libraries in Branch Library Catalogs (2)

c. Quality

Consistency in series added entry policies (4)
On-going editing of catalogs (2)
Better communication between public services and technical services (2)
Better notes on cards (1)
Improve quality of supplementary catalogs (1)
More detailed bibliographical description for rare and special items (1)
Review brieflisted items (1)
Improve accuracy of filing (1)
Better printing for cards and book catalogs (1)
Standardize filing among libraries (1)
Simplify filing (1)
More full cataloging (1)
Give full cataloging to everything (7)

D. Staffing

More individual assistance in URL public catalog (9)
Direct phone to URL public catalog (3)
Keep up Task Force project in URL public catalog (2)
Improve quality and training of filing personnel (2)
Improve level of training of staff updating serial holdings (1)
Have filing staff in catalog only during off-peak hours (1)

E. Orientation and Publicity

Courses in library use for students (4)
Include library use instruction in Subject A (2)
Required instruction for students (1)
Orientation in catalog use for staff at all levels (1)
Orientation on corporate entries (1)
Better signs (3)

- Publicize filing rules (2)
- Better visual aids (2)
- Instructional cards or leaflets (1)
- Better publicity for tours (1)
- Publicize preview catalog (e.g., catalog supplement) (1)
- Publish guides on specialized subjects (1)

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND OPINIONS ON CATALOGS FOR PUBLIC USE

Since interviews were designed to allow for as much freedom of expression as possible, not all units volunteered opinions on all, or even any, of the topics below. No attempt is made here to distinguish group from individual opinion, and the number of pro and con opinions cannot be interpreted as a statistical survey of unit opinion. The variety of opinion expressed on both practical and theoretical issues is included as being in itself of interest.

Catalog Cutoff

Since there has been considerable recent discussion of this possibility, it is not surprising that opinions on the subject were volunteered in 15 interviews:

- Catalog cutoff would be a disaster (7)
- Catalog cutoff would serve no purpose (5)
- Catalog cutoff would be desirable only if the new catalog represented change and definite improvement over the old (2)
- The catalog should be closed, put into book form, and supplemented on cards (1)

Of those opposing cutoff, several remarked that users dislike having to search in more than one catalog (see below). Interviewees from several units serving the arts, humanities, and social sciences mentioned that their users require access to the full range of materials, regardless of publication date, and that having catalogs devoted to recent materials only would be no benefit.

Size and Scope of Public Catalogs

Several units remarked that although the size of the URL catalog is forbidding, size in itself is not as significant as complexity of the whole or specific sections. Congestion in the card catalog was several times mentioned as an annoyance, and it was noted that any catalog should provide simultaneous access to as many users as possible. Other opinion included:

- Give full cataloging to everything (7)
- Represent all materials in collection, including non-book (6)
- URL catalog should have full representation of all branch holdings (4)
- Records in any form should contain as much information as possible (2)
- Records should be simplified to exclude non-essential information (2)

Organization of the Catalog

Prefer dictionary catalog (9)
Prefer divided catalog (6)
Unit opinion mixed on dictionary vs. divided catalog (3)
Chronological division for recent materials (1)

Like classified arrangement of subject cards (1)
Dislike classified arrangement of subject cards (1)

Physical Form of Cataloging

Prefer card catalog (6)
    (No person interviewed expressed a dislike of card catalogs)
Prefer book catalogs (4)
Dislike book catalogs (3)
Dislike printouts (2)

Investigate on-line systems (3)
    On-line systems must have multiple access (2)
Investigate microform catalogs (2)

Use MRC to produce cards for catalog (1)

Single Public Catalog vs. Multiple Records

Prefer card catalog for everything (7)
Full records of all serials in card catalog (1)
Full records of all newspapers in card catalog (1)

Serials list separate
    Prefer serials list in separate form (6)
    Include full retrospective holdings in serials list (4)
    Remove all serials holdings records from card catalog (1)
    Include government serial documents in serials list (1)

Newspaper list separate
    Prefer separate newspaper list (2)
    Include full retrospective holdings in newspaper list (2)
    Remove all newspaper listings from card catalog (2)

Catalog supplement
    Catalog supplement is a disadvantage (4)

Prefer separate dissertation list (1)
Prefer separate microfil catalog or list (1)

Would like public shelf list (2)

Patrons dislike having more than one place to look (8)

Production and Maintenance

All processing should be done centrally (1)
Catalog needs of branch can be met only if unit is self-cataloging (1)
Central cataloging staff do not understand requirements of branch (2)
On-going catalog editing is a necessity and should be a definite assignment (2)
Computerized listings need better editing (3)
Accept LC copy, CIP, etc., in interests of speed (1)

SUPPLEMENT: INTERLIBRARY LOANS

Pursuant to Subgroup C's information gathering activities, Edith M. Fuller of the Reference Department's Interlibrary Loan section remarked that about 10% of ILL borrowing requests are for items which are, in fact, available at UCLA. Ms. Fuller provided the Subgroup with 89 records forming a representative sample of such requests.

Although the reason for the patron's failure to find the desired item at UCLA is not always possible to determine with accuracy, these 89 records may be roughly tabulated as follows:

1. Patron apparently thought UCLA did not own:
    - Part of series (identified through verification) (18)
    - Wrong main entry (9)
    - In catalog supplement (2)
    - Filing order, e.g., initial article (1)
    - Newspaper holdings not accurately reflected in catalog (1)
    - Wrong title of serial (1)
    - Uncataloged item (1)
    - Reason for failure not identified (12)
2. Patron apparently thought UCLA copies all lost or missing:
    - URL copy lost/missing but another copy in another library or on film (21)
    - Item on shelf (19)
    - Charged to individual (3)
    - Charged to reserve section (2)
    - Pages missing from URL copy available in another library's copy (1)

USER SURVEY
Winter Quarter 1973

	Week of 2/12/73-2/18/73		Week of 3/12-3/18		Week of 3/26-3/31		Total 3 weeks	
	Total Exists from University Research Library		Total Exits from URL		Total Exists from URL		Total Exists from URL	
	Mon-Fri	Sat-Sun	Mon-Fri	Sat-Sun	Mon-Fri	Sat-Sun	Mon-Fri	Sat-Sun
	28,765	3,267	32,510	7,336	10,559	1,263	71,834	11,866
UCLA Undergraduates	43.7%	27.8%	52.7%	39.5%	17.0%	16.4%	42.4%	28.3%
UCLA Graduates	33.8	32.8	25.0	29.9	36.3	28.4	33.5	31.9
UCLA Academic Staff	3.4	2.5	5.1	5.1	10.3	8.6	4.0	3.5
UCLA Staff Personnel	2.1	1.7	2.9	3.8	7.1	2.6	2.5	2.0
Extension Students	.9	1.9	1.6	1.9	1.4	5.2	1.0	2.2
UCLA Library Staff	8.0	2.0	4.7	3.2	11.9	4.3	8.1	2.4
TOTAL UCLA	91.9%	68.7%	92.0%	83.4%	84.0%	65.5%	91.5%	70.3%
Students & Faculty from:								
Cal. State Univs.	.8	4.2	1.6	2.5	1.9	13.8	.9	5.0
Other UC Campuses	.4	2.6	.3	1.4	1.8	5.1	.5	2.7
Other Colleges & Univs.	1.6	8.9	1.6	7.0	3.2	7.8	1.6	8.5
Students from Local High Schools	.2	1.9	.3	-	1.5	-	.3	1.6
General Public	5.1	13.7	4.2	5.7	7.6	7.8	5.2	11.9
TOTAL OFF-CAMPUS	8.1%	31.3%	8.0%	16.6%	16.0%	34.5%	8.5%	29.7%
	Sixth Week of Winter Quarter		Tenth Week of Winter Quarter		Intersession			

	Week of 1/22-1/23 Total Reference Contacts in URL		Week of 2/12-2/18 Total Reference Contacts in URL		Week of 3/12-3/18 Total Reference Contacts in URL		Week of 3/26-3/31 Total Reference Contacts in URL		Total 4 Weeks Total Reference Contacts in URL	
	Mon-Fri	Sat-Sun	Mon-Fri	Sat-Sun	Mon-Fri	Sat-Sun	Mon-Fri	Sat	Mon-Fri	Sat-Sun
	2,033	366	1,761	589	2,058	574	1,174	196	7,026	1,725
UCLA Undergraduates	26.3%	21.6%	28.0%	34.5%	39.6%	36.1%	13.3%	10.7%	25.3%	26.2%
UCLA Graduates	33.1	30.3	34.6	25.1	27.5	19.9	27.0	17.9	30.7	24.0
UCLA Academic Staff	6.6	.8	6.8	3.1	6.1	1.3	8.7	8.2	7.1	2.7
UCLA Staff Personnel	4.6	3.3	3.7	1.7	3.2	1.6	6.4	.5	4.7	2.0
Extension Students	1.4	1.1	1.0	-	.7	3.2	1.5	1.5	1.2	1.6
UCLA Library Staff	1.0	.3	1.5	-	1.3	.9	2.0	2.0	1.4	.7
TOTAL UCLA	73.0%	57.4%	75.6%	64.4%	78.4%	63.0%	58.9%	40.8%	70.4%	57.2%
Students & Faculty from:										
Cal. State Univs.	3.2	5.2	2.2	5.2	2.1	5.1	4.8	11.7	3.3	6.4
Other UC Campuses	1.8	5.5	1.3	8.4	1.3	1.9	3.6	3.2	2.1	4.5
Other Colleges & Univs.	4.8	6.8	4.1	3.2	4.4	7.6	8.5	15.8	5.6	8.0
Students from Local High Schools	.8	3.2	.5	2.6	1.2	4.0	1.5	6.6	1.2	4.1
General Public	16.4	21.9	16.3	16.2	12.6	18.4	22.7	21.9	17.4	19.8
TOTAL OFF-CAMPUS	27.0%	42.6%	24.4%	35.6%	21.6%	37.0%	41.1%	59.2%	29.6%	42.8%
	Third Week of Winter Quarter		Sixth Week of Winter Quarter		Tenth Week of Winter Quarter		Intersession			

57–

	Week of 1/22-1/28		Week of 2/12-2/18		Week of 3/12-3/18		Week of 3/28-3/31		Total 4 Weeks	
	Total Exist from College Library		Total Exist from College Library		Total Exists from College Library		Total Exits from College Library		Total Exits from College Library	
	Mon-Fri	Sat-Sun	Mon-Fri	Sat-Sun	Mon-Fri	Sat-Sun	Wed-Fri	Sat	Mon-Fri	Sat-Sun
	8,863	1,124	9,850	2.356	13,794	2,547	1,462	341	33,969	6,368
UCLA Undergraduates	69.4%	51.4%	71.2%	53.7%	70.2%	64.6%	41.3%	20.5%	68.6%	51.3%
UCLA Graduates	15.2	15.3	16.1	16.2	15.8	12.9	20.8	14.8	15.4	15.0
UCLA Academic Staff	.6	1.5	.9	1.2	.8	.8	4.0	3.3	.7	1.5
UCLA Staff Personnel	2.2	1.3	3.0	1.3	1.2	2.1	10.4	.8	2.5	1.4
Extension Students	.7	1.0	1.5	1.3	5.2	4.2	.9	4.9	1.0	1.8
UCLA Library Staff	2.5	1.6	2.2	-	1.2	.4	8.1	3.3	2.6	1.4
TOTAL UCLA	90.6%	72.1%	94.9%	73.7%	94.4%	85.0%	85.5%	47.6%	90.8%	72.4%
Students & Faculty from:										
Cal. State Univs.	1.7	7.7	.4	4.4	1.0	2.5	.9	5.7	1.5	6.5
Other UC Campuses	.6	1.8	-	1.9	-	1.7	.9	2.4	.5	1.7
Other Colleges & Univs.	1.3	4.5	.7	4.4	1.2	5.4	2.3	14.8	1.3	5.4
Students from Local High Schools	.4	2.4	-	3.1	.4	1.2	.9	15.6	.5	3.3
General Public	5.4	11.5	4.0	12.5	3.0	4.2	9.5	13.9	5.4	10.7
TOTAL OFF-CAMPUS	9.4%	27.9%	5.1%	26.3%	5.6%	15.0%	14.5%	52.4%	9.2%	27.6%
	Third Week of Winter Quarter		Sixth Week of Winter Quarter		Tenth Week of Winter Quarter		Intersession			

	Week of 1/22-1/28		Week of 2/12-2/18		Week of 3/12-3/18		Week of 3/28-3/31		Total 4 Weeks	
	Total Reference Contacts in College Library		Total Reference Contacts in College Library		Total Reference Contacts in College Library		Total Reference Contacts in College Library		Total Reference Contacts in College Library	
	Mon-Fri	Sat-Sun	Mon-Fri	Sat-Sun	Mon-Fri	Sat-Sun	Wed-Fri	Sat	Mon-Fri	Sat-Sun
	1,253	196	1,468	267	1,831	297	1,095	78	5,647	838
UCLA Undergraduates	64.6%	46.0%	69.2%	48.7%	62.4%	70.9%	41.8%	17.9%	64.9%	46.8%
UCLA Graduates	12.8	10.2	10.5	11.6	6.2	5.1	16.8	2.6	11.7	9.2
UCLA Academic Staff	1.1	.5	1.5	1.7	3.6	-	3.0	1.3	1.7	1.0
UCLA Staff Personnel	2.4	1.1	3.8	1.1	2.6	2.5	6.0	-	3.3	1.1
Extension Students	.9	-	.7	.8	7.2	2.5	1.3	-	1.3	.6
UCLA Library Staff	1.7	-	1.1	2.2	1.0	-	1.7	2.6	1.3	1.3
TOTAL UCLA	83.5%	57.8%	87.1%	65.9%	83.0%	81.0%	70.6%	24.4%	84.2%	60.0%
Students & Faculty from:										
Cal. State Univs.	2.4	9.1	1.4	6.7	2.1	-	1.7	11.5	1.8	7.2
Other UC Campuses	1.3	3.1	.8	3.0	.5	2.5	3.5	5.1	1.3	3.4
Other Colleges & Univs.	3.5	7.5	1.8	10.5	4.6	5.1	6.9	17.9	3.0	9.8
Students from Local High Schools	2.4	7.5	4.2	4.9	2.6	7.6	3.5	14.2	3.3	7.2
General Public	6.9	15.0	4.7	9.0	7.2	3.8	13.8	26.9	6.4	12.4
TOTAL OFF-CAMPUS	16.5%	42.2%	12.9%	34.1%	17.0%	19.0%	29.4%	75.6%	15.8%	40.0%
	Third Week of Winter Quarter		Sixth Week of Winter Quarter		Tenth Week of Winter Quarter		Intersession			

B. Interviews with Staff and Faculty Authorities

Those individuals chosen to be interviewed by the Subgroup were: Eleanore Friedgood, retiring Editor of the URL catalog; Professor Seymour Lubetzky, internal authority on catalogs and cataloging; and Professor Charles Gullans of the English Department, one of the most sophisticated faculty users of the Library, particularly in the area of the humanities.

Areas of Agreement

1. Staff assistance to users of the public catalog is an essential ingredient of orientation on catalog use. One f.t.e., at least, would be stationed permanently at the URL catalog. This person should be a professional librarian with full background and experience in both technical and public services, should maintain frequent liaison with both reference and cataloging personnel, and should keep records of difficulties encountered by users.

2. Whatever the future of the existing catalog, it should be upgraded by eliminating inconsistencies, errors, past disasters, etc. "The public catalog of a research library is the single most important tool in a scholar's research; and anything that impairs the integrity of the catalog is a threat to his scholarly purposes." (Gullans)

3. Whatever new information access system(s) may be added to, or substituted for, the present catalog, the most important consideration should be that "we put all of our effort into seeing that it is done well, for our future as scholars and librarians is dependent on its being done well." (Gullans)

Areas of Disagreement

Two of the three individuals interviewed were in favor of catalog cutoff with conversion to MRB to produce a new catalog. Both of these felt strongly that the existing URL card catalog should be thoroughly edited before cutoff; one felt that the present catalog should be divided as well as edited. Both felt that the new catalog should be a divided catalog; one thought that this divided catalog should be kept continuously up to date by card supplements.

The third individual favored retaining the existing catalog, with rigorous editing and improvement.

The User

From the Use Questionnaire and from Circulation use statistics it appears that the URL card catalog user is an almost equal mix of graduate and undergraduate students with the undergraduate having a slight edge. A variety of staff, faculty, and off-campus users comprise about one-fifth of the total.

The patron's primary purpose in catalog use is most often related to course or degree requirements, but personal interest apparently represents about one-third of the use.

The patron comes to the card catalog intent on finding his material without the time for sign reading nor the patience for lengthy explanations or for seeking help unless immediately at hand. Frequently he comes with shortcomings of his own such as language and spelling difficulties or with incomplete or incorrect citations. Some of his misinformation has been supplied to him by the faculty.

The patron usually approaches the card catalog with a known author or title but more often than the Reference Desk compilation would indicate he is seeking information on a subject.

Whatever his purpose, the patron is, in many cases, unsure of the nature of the catalog. Does it include author, title, and subject in one alphabet? If he is looking for a subject, he may need help with the choice of the subject heading as well as where and how it may appear in one of the 7,433 catalog drawers. If he is looking for a periodical or newspaper article, he is often unsure of what the catalog provides in this respect.

The physical arrangement of the catalog, its size and its arrangement in the room, and the likelihood of misplaced catalog trays cause some difficulty, but this is minor compared with the confusion caused by the filing arrangement. Filing errors are responsible for some patron difficulty but much more frequent are the failures caused by complications of the filing structure. Voluminous authors, corporate authors, compound surnames, articles, initials, government publications, subjects and subject subdivisions are only some of the causes of troubles with filing.

The desired card, once found, does not end obstacles to be overcome. The information on the card is often misleading, unclear, or outdated. The devices are not clear. Puzzling, too, is seemingly gratuitous information on the card such as "CLU" or "number of copies limited to 150." Particular idosyncracies such as the variety of branch and temporary cataloging cards, lack of subject headings for all libraries, and blind see references contribute to the patron's perplexity.

Despite the number of problems and complexities identified, it is striking that general reaction to the URL card catalog is essentially favorable. Both Task Force surveys record a large majority of positive responses by users of the library.

III. USER SURVEYS

Given the lack of evidence of the usefulness of user surveys (and limited as any Subgroup C survey must be by time, money, and survey experience), the Subgroup did make use of three sources of URL user information. Although no statistical evidence presents itself from these surveys, some facts, rather than opinions and impressions, can be added to the knowledge about the URL user, his approach to the catalog, his successes and failures along with the reasons for the successes and failures. Some insight into actual survey preparation, techniques, and tabulation was gained as well. The survey information substantiated other data and confirmed long-held presumptions. This data, along with unit and personal interviews, conversations with others, and general experience with the use of the card catalog and the card catalog user served as part of the basis upon which the Subgroup recommendations were made.

The Reference Survey

The URL Reference staff kindly agreed to fill out a form recording in-person assistance given to users of the URL card catalog. It was understood that no effort was to be made to record all encounters between card catalog users and Reference staff but only those encounters with the staff were able to record at a later time. The form design fortunately was excellent in insuring useful responses and in being apparently relatively easy to fill out. Information from 231 transactions (Appendix A) was captured in a five-week period midpoint in the 1974 Winter quarter. The classification and tabulation of the data was more difficult, but even a cursory look at the summary is useful. It must be remembered that this information came from the user who required assistance with the URL card catalog.

The Task Force Card Catalog Project

The Task Force Card Catalog Project Reports (Appendix B) also only record information about the URL user who needs assistance with the catalog. The information in the report was gathered over a one year period of 10 hours per week providing user aid at the card catalog by four staff members. Again the information is not statistical but falls into the common pattern of knowledge about the card catalog user.

The Task Force Use Questionnaire

The Task Force Use Questionnaire (Appendix C) differs from the other two surveys in that the information was gathered at random from 300 people who happened to be in the URL catalog area in the fourth and fifth weeks of the Winter quarter. These people were not necessarily card catalog users. The information was compiled statisfically but it is the interpretation of the questionnarie and the random comments that are supportive of the other survey findings.

Additional Observations

There should be a required course on the use of the library basic to the curriculum.

Primary emphasis in the production of all catalog information, in whatever form, should be on quality, not quantity.

III. USER SURVEYS
APPENDIX A

URL Reference Desk Record

For approximately five weeks (February 21-March 29, 1974) the URL Reference Desk staff kept a record of 231 in-person transactions involving assistance with the URL public catalogs. Transactions were recorded only at times when the staff had leisure to do so. Thus, the record accumulated is neither a full representation nor a statistically valid sample of catalog assistance provided during that period. It was intended only to provide documentation of some characteristic public catalog difficulties and is not appropriate for statistical evaluation.

The form used (sample attached) was designed to be completed entirely from the librarian's observation [illegible]d not require the librarian to ask the patron for any information not directly related to the problem at hand. Patrons were not aware that these transactions were being recorded. Most of the transactions involved patrons who had approached the Reference Desk for assistance, but a few took place at the card catalog.

Although, as noted, this is not a statistical record, the following figures are possibly of interest:

231 transactions were recorded.

183 were specific item searches, 43 were subject searches, and 5 were requests for general orientation to the catalog.

193 were initiated by the patron; in other instances, the librarian volunteered assistance or explanation.

In 141 instances, the librarian accompanied the patron to the catalog.

In 129 instances it was determined that the patron had already searched the catalog, and in 11 instances that the patron requested assistance before beginning his search.

72 requests were for interpretation of information found in the catalog.

In 51 instances, the patron had incomplete or incorrect information.

16 transactions involved consultation of the LC subject heading list and 27 involved verification in a bibliographical source.

In 21 instances the librarian recommended a course of action other than using the catalog.

A number of transactions involved more than one element of difficulty, e.g., unfamiliarity with corporate author principle and incomplete information, or unfamiliarity with filing arrangement and lack of a see reference. However, it can be noted that the major probable reasons that assistance was necessary including the following:

Filing rules - 42
Patron's incomplete or incorrect information - 35
Patron's general unfamiliarity with or unwillingness to use catalog - 21
Subject heading structure - 26
Corporate author - 20
Puzzling information on card - 20
Location - 19
See references - 10
Newspaper form heading - 7
Multiple catalogs - 8
CLU on card - 7
Lack of analytics - 5

INDEX OF IDENTIFIED DIFFICULTIES

General Aspects of Catalogs

- Dictionary arrangement
  - Asked for subject catalog
  - Asked for author-title catalog

- Types of cards
  - Confused title and subject cards
  - Could not distinguish author from subject card
  - Confused journal title and subject heading
  - Temporary cards
  - Brieflisting cards

- Multiple catalogs
  - Failed to check cat. sup.
  - Thought all new books are in cat. sup., failed to check card catalog
  - Failed to check card cat. for serial after checking serial list
  - Failed to check card cat. or serial list after checking PRR rotary file
  - Failed to check card cat. for holdings of earlier vols. of serial in serial list
  - Item listed in both card cat. and cat. sup. for different libraries
  - No card in PC for serial in serials list
  - No card in PC for microfilm holding of serials - only in serials list

- Physical
  - Misplaced trays
  - Cards temporarily removed from catalog, no temporary cards
  - Confusing labeling on trays

See References

- Failed to understand instructions on see ref
  - Did not note correct spelling of author name
  - Did not understand element under which to look for compound author name
  - Confused by printed LIBRARY OF CONGRESS REFERENCE, entirely missed real reference to entry.

- Temporary see ref note confusing

- Blind/dead see ref

- Unable to understand see ref for newspaper form entry

- See ref to voluminous author work with spelling variations

- See ref lacking for author pseudonym
  - For later name of journal

- Searials list
  - No see ref for former name of journal
  - No see ref to main entry

INDEX OF DIFFICULTIES (2)

Entry

- Corporate entry
  - California University
  - U.S. government publications
  - Corporate author of journal
  - Corporate author as main entry for work also having personal authors
  - Congress proceedings
  - Museum listed under name of city
  - Confused corporate entry with title in citation
  - Corporate author as both author and title

- Personal author entry
  - Real name vs pseudonym
  - Form of author name in catalog differs from familiar usage

- Form entries
  - Newspapers
  - Dissertations

- Lack of title entry

- Main entry - general
- Branch holdings listed only under main entry
- Other editions listed only under main entry
- Serials holdings listed only under main entry
- Inconsistent main entry for cards from self-cataloging branch

Subject headings

- LC subject heading structure
  - Needed to check LC list for correct headings
  - No appropriate subject heading in LC list or supplements

- No "see also" reference for subject heading in catalog

- Inconsistent application of subject headings

- Chronological subdivisions of subject heading

Analytics lacking for series

Materials excluded from catalog

- Current government publications
- Individual periodical articles
- Individual plays in collection

Serial holdings

- Serial holdings not fully represented on checking card (bound volumes in stacks)

INDEX OF DIFFICULTIES (3)

Obsolete newspaper holdings
Confused serial main entry as indication of UCLA holdings; missed checking card
No serial holdings for branch given in card catalog.

Catalog Supplement

Keypunching error causing misfile
Call number in catalog supplement reproduced poorly, unreadable.

Filing Order

Umlauts and other discritical marks

Hyphenated words

Interfiling of titles and subjects with subdivisions

Authors, personal
  Compound surname
  Names beginning with St.
  Mc, Mac, M'
  Voluminous author filing
    Standared titles in voluminous author filing

Authors, corporate
  California University individual campuses
  New York entries
  U.S. Government entries
  "International" headings
  Subheadings of corporate authors
  University listed by name of city with name of country counted in filing although not on card

Initials
  Filed at beginning of letter
  Initials vs. acronyms filed as words

Word by word filing vs. letter by letter

Separate drawer for Clark holdings on Oscar Wilde

Bible

Misfile

Unreadable cards

Brieflisted card - title page lettering small and unclear
Holdings information unclear on photocopied branch holdings card

INDEX OF DIFFICULTIES (4)

Information on Cards

CLU
  Interpreted as meaning work is in College Library
  General queries about significance

Notes (e.g., "number of copies limited to 150") thought significant in location

Required interpretation of complicated pagination information for bibliography

IIR

Different call nos. for 2 copies of same work, one classed with series

Symbols (*, #, etc.)

Misread 1 for l and vice-versa

Author's birthdate interpreted as book publication date

Temporary card with no call no., title, or cataloger's initials

Call number for branch on back of card

Confusions of "Newspaper Stacks" and "Film" on Newspaper holdings card

Branch Library Locations

Holdings listed only under main entry
Misread location on Checking card for serial
Misread location on checking card for monograph
Failed to note branch designation above call number
Confusing branch location handwritten on old locator card (SAUP)
Branch holding only listed under added entry, though main entry shows URL copy
Failed to see card for URL copy, saw only branch copy card
Call number in branch listed on back of card

Special Locations in URL

Archives
* for oversized
Location of ** and ***
Brieflisted item - misread instruction as meaning it was held at Reference Desk
Location of Microfilm

Item Evidently Not in Collection

INDEX OF DIFFICULTIES (5)

Patron-related problems

- Incomplete information
  - Lacked author first name
  - Lacked author full first name
  - Had only name of secondary author
  - Lacked author name entirely
  - Serial subtitle, lacked maintitle
  - Lacked serial subtitle necessary to find in file
  - Reversed title and subtitle
  - Had only abbreviation of serial title
  - Lacked name of corporate author
  - Had only vague title reference, no author name
  - Lacked series note for unanalyzed series
- Wrong information
  - Misspelled author name
  - Misspelled word for subject or title search
  - Wrong reference to periodical title
  - Incorrect serial title
  - Citation to German language item in grammatical form differing from entry form
  - Wrong transliteration of non-Roman alphabet
- Unfamiliar with URL catalog

- Generally unfamiliar with library catalogs

- Unwilling to check catalog

- Language difficulty

- Overlooked item in catalog (search made or correct principles)

REFERENCE DESK IN-PERSON CATALOG ASSISTANCE SURVEY

The purpose of this survey is to identify elements in the public card catalog's organization and contents that may present difficulties to library users. It is part of a study being conducted by Subgroup C (User Requirements) of the UCLA Library Working Group on Public Catalogs; it is hoped that the end result with be a series of recommendations to make public catalogs more useable.

The above explanation may be offered to patrons who ask what you are writing down.

Instructions:

1. Record each encounter on a separate form, as often as time permits.
2. Try to state the reason why assistance was necessary, even if you cannot complete any other category, but
3. Complete entire form whenever practical. All categories of information are useful for this study.

A. Type of search:

( ) Specific item(s)
( ) Subject
( ) Serial or newspaper holding
( ) Other (specify)

B. Assistance given at:

( ) Patron's request
( ) Librarian's initiative

C. Form of assistance:

( ) Explanation of catalog
( ) Personal assistance with search
( ) Suggested alternate approach, did not use catalog

D. Additional information (check each relevant category):

( ) Patron was referred to reference desk for help
( ) Patron had searched unsuccessfully on his own
( ) Patron required interpretation of information found in catalog
( ) Patron had incomplete or incorrect information
( ) Search required verification in a reference source (state source and outcome)

E. State probable reason assistance was necessary (e.g., filing technicality, form of entry, information on card unclear, etc.):

F. Comments:

DEPOSIT COMPLETED FORMS IN RIGHT CENTER DRAWER OF REFERENCE DESK

CARD CATA

1. Status (check one)
   _____ UCLA Undergraduate
   _____ UCLA Graduate
   _____ Extension
   _____ Undergraduate--other college or university
   _____ Graduate--other college or university
   _____ Academic UCLA
   _____ Staff-UCLA Library
   _____ Staff--UCLA non-Library
   _____ Other
2. Why are you using the card catalog? (check one or mo
   _____ Class assignment
   _____ Research
   _____ Job Assignment
   _____ Personal interest
3. How often do you use the card catalog?
   _____ Daily
   _____ Weekly
   _____ Monthly
   _____ Less frequently than any above
4. Do you usually look in the card catalog for a speci author, title or subject?
   _____ Yes
   _____ No
   _____ If so, which?
5. Is the filing arrangement in the catalog clear to y
   _____ Yes
   _____ No
6. Do you sometimes find information on the catalog card you do not understand?
   _____ Yes
   _____ No
7. Does the card catalog tell you where the book is located:
   _____ Yes
   _____ No

Attachment 1

QUESTIONNAIRE

Time:
Place:
Interviewer:

. Do you know how to find periodicals in the catalog?
_____ Yes
_____ No

. Do you know how to look for a newspaper?
_____ Yes
_____ No

. Do you know how to research a specific subject in the catalog?
_____ Yes
_____ No

. Do you know what the Catalog Supplement is?
_____ Yes
_____ No

. Do you usually find what you are look for?
_____ Yes
_____ No

. If you don't find what you are looking for, what do you do?

____

____

____

____

4. Do you have any suggestions for the improvement of the catalog.

____

____

____

____

CARD CA

1. Status (check one)
   _____ UCLA Undergraduate
   _____ UCLA Graduate
   _____ Extension
   _____ Undergraduate--other college or university
   _____ Graduate--other college or university
   _____ Academic UCLA
   _____ Staff--UCLA Library
   _____ Staff--UCLA non-library
   _____ Other
2. Why do you usually use the card catalog?
   (check one or more)
   _____ Class Assignment
   _____ Research
   _____ Job Assignment
   _____ Personal interest
3. How often do you use the card catalog?
   _____ Daily
   _____ Weekly
   _____ Monthly
   _____ Less frequent than any above
4. Do you usually look in the card catalog for:
   _____ Author?
   _____ Title?
   _____ Subject:
5. Has the filing arrangement in the catalog ever
   confused you?
   _____ Yes
   _____ No
   _____ How?
6. What information do you use on the catalog card?
   _____ Author
   _____ Title
   _____ Place
   _____ Publisher
   _____ Date
   _____ Edition
   _____ Pagination
   _____ Series
   _____ Tracings
   _____ Holdings
   _____ Notes
   _____ Call #
7. Do you ever have questions about information on
   the catalog card?
   _____ Yes
   _____ No

Attachment 2

UESTIONNAIRE

Time:
Place:
Interviewer:

8. How can you tell which library a book is in?
___ Yes
___ No

9. How do you find periodicals in the catalog?
___ Yes
___ No

0. How do you look for a newspaper in the catalog?
___ Yes
___ No

1. How do you research a specific subject in the catalog?
___ Yes
___ No

12. Do you know what the Catalog Supplement is?
___ Yes
___ No

13. Do you usually find what you are looking for in the card catalog?
___ Yes
___ No

14. If you don't find what you are looking for in the card catalog, what do you do?

____

____

15. Do you have any suggestions for the improvement of the catalog?

____

____

16. Is there anything you would like to know about the card catalog?

____

____

____

____

IV. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

In fulfilling its charge, the study of how patrons and library staff use public catalogs, Subgroup C soon found itself totally immersed in catalog deficiencies, particularly those of the URL card catalog. It is easy to lose sight of the fact that the card catalog does meet the needs of many varied and demanding patrons. In an endeavor of this kind there is a tendency to forget the extensive and intensive demands on the card catalog, its constantly changing nature, its size and its excellence. It must be remembered also that the guide to a complex library must be complex, and that the UCLA Library has a responsibility to its users to provide an adequate guide of high quality no matter how large or how complex.

Subgroup C, in arriving at its recommendations, attempted to summarize areas of agreement and disagreement in the literature, in the interviews, and in the surveys. It is difficult but possible to codify the mass of material in the literature into some meaningful pattern. The interviews and surveys are impossible to synthesize in the same way, but enough of a correlation between the three aspects of the study presented itself to make the final recommendations unavoidable.

Users Surveys

Since the numerous catalog use surveys and related studies that have been conducted have failed to arrive at definite conclusions as to the needs of the user, Subgroup C sees no point in attempting a general catalog use survey at UCLA at this time. Catalog use research is being done and will continue to be done in various libraries, and the Subgroup's experiments with surveys indicate that the results of a general use survey at UCLA would probably tend to confirm the findings of suveys at comparable institutions. Most such research is currently being done on a very large scale, over long periods of time, and with substantial funding. The cost and time which would be required to mount yet another full-scale study at UCLA are forbidding to contemplate.

However, the Subgroup feels that limited surveys covering certain aspects of catalog use could well prove to be fruitful. Such surveys should be precisely defined and planned, if possible, with the assistance of experts in such fields as market research and scientific sampling. The experience of the Task Force in its trial survey indicates that surveys must be very carefully planned and that outside expertise is probably necessary to design meaningful use surveys.

One such survey might be a comparative study of the catalog use patterns of scientists, social scientists, and humanists, as background for planning future requirements for the catalogs of specific units, and especially for the URL catalog in its function as a union catalog for the UCLA library system.

Another possibility would be to conduct surveys in specific library units. Certain units have stated in interviews that they would like to study use of their own catalogs.

Assistance at Public Catalogs

In both the literature survey and the unit interviews there is almost universal agreement that direct assistance for users should be provided at public catalogs. The literature indicates that such assistance not only improves the quality of catalog use, but material increases the amount of it.

Staff and user reaction to the Task Force Card Catalog Project proves most convincingly the need for this service at the URL card catalog. A number of non-URL units have expressed a need for more direct personal assistance with their own catalogs and would provide it if they had staff to do so.

UCLA library staff and the individual experts interviewed feel strongly that the level of experience and skill of personnel offering this service should be very high. This opinion is confirmed in the literature.

Several units feel that a direct telephone line to the URL catalog would be among the greatest aids they could receive, allowing them to provide far better service to their patrons than is now possible.

Orientation

Another point upon which there is almost universal agreement in the literature and among units and experts interviewed is that more and better instruction in catalog use would be highly beneficial to the user. Opinions differ, however, as to how much instruction should be given, or in what form, or at what stage of the user's experience with the library.

Subgroup C did not undertake to survey the literature of instruction and orientation in library use. However, the Subgroup is convinced that more and better instruction in the use of public catalogs is seriously needed, particularly for the student user. Therefore, the Subgroup recommends that intensive investigation be made of the various methods of orientation and that careful evaluation be made of the methods currently in use at UCLA, with a view toward mounting an adequate program of instruction that will provide students with necessary orientation in the use of campus libraries and their catalogs.

Although reservations were expressed in many interviews as to the effectiveness of signs as orientation aids, opinion was fairly uniform that more signs, and in particular, more visible and informative signs, are desirable and should be provided in the URL card catalog and in other units, as needed.

Editing the URL Card Catalog

As stated in the section of interviews with staff and faculty authorities, "whatever the future of the existing catalog, it should be upgraded by eliminating inconsistencies, errors, past disasters, etc." The New York Public Library agreed with this principle and planned to edit its catalog before closing it. However, it failed to do so, with consequences we do not yet know. Since no decision has been made at UCLA on catalog cutoff, we should take advantage of the opportunity to perform this necessary, if onerous, task.

Many catalog shortcomings identified in unit interviews and surveys could be remedied by a rigorous editing of the URL card catalog that would include the following:

- Correction of filing errors
- Replacement of worn, broken, illegible cards
- Correction of misleading and outdated information (symbols, locations, etc.)
- Removal of CLU and catalogers' initials from permanent cards
- Review of all brieflisting and other temporary cards and removal of those for which permanent records have been placed in the catalog
- Removal of obsolete see references.

In addition, special attention should be given to known problem areas:

- Newspaper listings, which should be fully reviewed and corrected as to both holdings and location notes
- Sequences (such as London (England)) in which an element influencing filing order does not always appear on the card
- Sequences in which refiling is necessary because of new filing rules
- Voluminous authors for which a unified title system has been adopted

Editing the URL card catalog is a formidable undertaking and should be carefully planned and executed. Some preliminary determination of the amount and kind of work to be done would be necessary. A Task Force project working with limited sections of the catalog most needing attention might serve as a basis for planning a complete editing project.

Processing Policy

Certain general aspects of processing have been identified in unit interviews as causing serious provlems. These are:

- Delays in processing of newly-acquired materials
- Inadequate communication between processing units and public services staff, and between central processing staff and non-URL units
- Insufficient experienced and well-trained staff for proper catalog maintenance (e.g., filing adding serial holdings, etc.)

A great many of the user difficulties with the URL card catalog that were identified in unit interviews and in the surveys could probably be solved by changes in local processing policies. Among these difficulties are:

- Unclear location indicators such as lack of "see also" references, insufficient "see" references, insufficient references from alternate serial titles, blind references, and Library of Congress printed references
- Insufficient analytics
- SAE arrangement by author rather than by series number
- Too frequent and inconsistent use of SNU
- Filing by title under added entries (except SAE)
- Misleading symbols on the face of the card, such as CLU or catalogers' initials

Lack of standardization of the handling of many types of material

There are other desirable changes brought out in the surveys which involve major and long-standing local or national policies. These would require careful study. Such changes should be jointly planned by processing and public service staff and tested by pilot projects. Implications for state-wide cooperative efforts must be taken into consideration.

The fact remains that the goal of any change should be to improve catalog quality and bibliographic access for the patron without sacrificing processing speed, which is another important user requirement.

The Future of the URL Card Catalog

Subgroup C's literature search has discovered no solid evidence that any other form of catalog is superior to the dictionary card catalog. Indeed, there appears to be a trend away from the vogue for book catalogs, and the only substantial study of searches in dictionary vs. divided catalogs found that there was no significant difference for the use. And, as Krikelas states, "A mere change in the format of the catalog does not guarantee an increase in user performance." Therefore, Subgroup C recommends that the URL public catalog continue in its dictionary card form for the time being.

Retention of one form of catalog should not preclude experimentation with the production of specialized lists that provide additional or more convenient points of access for the user. For example, the dictionary card catalog would provide approaches by author, title, and subject for all cataloged materials. An auxiliary catalog might contain a smaller, frequently sought after body of material, such as current periodicals, listed by the same elements and also by language and country of origin.

Although no literature has yet been published on user reaction to catalog cutoff, there are indications from various surveys that users very much dislike having to look in more than one place or alphabet and often refuse to do so. The level of perseverance is low; only about 50% of catalog users will try a second entry after an initial failure. Most users either have no idea of the date of the book they are looking for or are at least five years off when they do estimate a date. Users will look for subject headings in a clearly labelled author-title catalog. Indeed, the whole pattern of user behavior, as revealed in the literature, argues against cutoff.

The user's dislike of having to look in more than one place was also frequently remarked in unit interviews. The test surveys undertaken by Subgroup C support survey literature findings on the user's low persistence and inability to adjust to multiple catalogs or forms of catalogs.

Of the fifteen library units which volunteered opinions on catalog cutoff, seven felt that such a move would be disastrous, five felt it would serve no purpose, and two felt it would be desirable only if the new catalog represented change and definite improvement over the old. There was one statement in favor of cutoff. Of those opposing cutoff, several units observed that their users require access to the entire chronological range of materials. The general conclusion that may be reached is that there is considerable feeling among the library staff on the subject of catalog cutoff, and the feeling is predominantly opposed.

Investigations should be made of user reactions to catalog cutoff in institutions where this has already occurred. Since there seems to be no literature as yet produced on this subject, Subgroup C recommends that small teams be sent to appraise the situation at such institutions as the New York Public Library.

The superiority of one form of catalog over another is often asserted but rarely or never proved by objective evidence. It would, therefore, seem essential to set up mechanisms for assessing user satisfaction with any major change in public catalog policy or with any new or experimental type of catalog or list for public use.

Recommendations of the Working Group on Public Catalogs

The conslusions of Subgroup C, based upon the literature search, the unit and individual interviews, and the test surveys, may require modification depending upon the findings of Subgroups A and B. The Subgroup C recommendations that follow are, of course, subject to the consensus of the total Working Group membership.

Aware of the difficulties of effecting change in a large and complex organization, Subgroup C feels that a built-in fail-safe system should be included in the Working Group's final recommendations. It would be shameful to let the time and talent which has gone into the Working Group's activities accomplish nothing of benefit to the patron. The danger of such a possibility is made manifest by reading the April, 1956, Staff Survey of the UCLA Library Card Catalog. Many of the problems which seemed to plague the user in 1956 are still of concern in 1974.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS OF SUBGROUP C

1. User surveys
   - A. No comprehensive catalog use survey should be undertaken at this time at UCLA.
   - B. Small, precisely designed surveys of special aspects of catalog use or of use in individual library units would be desirable.

2. Assistance at Public Catalogs
   - A. Beginning with 1974/75, assistance to patrons should be provided at the URL public catalog in an amount equivalent to one FTE. Staff assigned to this task should be experienced UCLA career personnel and should represent a wide range of URL units.
   - B. Immediate consideration should be given to requests from non-URL units for additional personnel for catalog user assistance.
   - C. A direct telephone line to the URL catalog should be made available.

3. Orientation
   - A. Subgroup C sees a serious need for more and better instruction in the use of public catalogs, but is not prepared to make specific recommendations as to the type and amount of orientation that should be given. Investigation of methods of orientation, including classroom, audio-visual, self-guided, and other methods, should be given high priority for immediate action toward planning catalog use instruction.
   - B. More signs, and more effective signs, should be provided in the URL card catalog area, and in other units as needed.

4. Editing of the URL Card Catalog
   - A. The URL card catalog should be edited. The parts of the catalog with serious known difficulties should be done first. Editing should include correction of misleading and outdated information as well as of filing errors.
   - B. The Library Task Force might help to define the project as to time and kinds of work required by carrying out a test edit on limited sections of the catalog approximating some ten or more drawers.
   - C. Editing should begin within six months after the recommendation is accepted.

5. Processing Policies
   - A. Changes should be made in those aspects of processing which are causing difficulties for the catalog user.
   - B. A system to study those changes, and to implement them within a reasonable time, should be devised.

6. The Future of the Card Catalog
   - A. For the present, the URL public catalog should continue to be a dictionary card catalog.
   - B. Any practical means of providing new approaches to collections or more convenient listings of specific bodies of material--in addition to, not in lieu of existing catalogs--should be explored.

C. No major innovation in public catalog form or policy should be undertaken until a pilot project has determined that user satisfaction will be equalled or, if possible, increased by the proposed change. A dual system should be maintained throughout the test period.

D. If catalog cutoff is contemplated, investigation should be made of user reaction in institutions where this has already occurred.

7. Recommendations of the Working Group on Public Catalogs

The Working Group's final report should include the establishment of time frames for follow-up on recommendations with the library administration.

March 20, 1974

EVERETT T. MOORE

TASK FORCE CARD CATALOG PROJECT

On April 1, 1974, the Task Force will have completed one year on the card catalog project. Since there is little likelihood that other arrangements will be made by April 1 and rather than suspend service, the Task Force proposes to continue the project until such time as administrative decisions are made.

The Task Force does not consider the project as a permanent assignment nor is it able to use more than ten hours per week on the project. Should there be an opportunity to expand hours of service with other staff members who meet Reference requirements, the Task Force will attempt such an extension of service on an informal basis.

There is little to add to the reports already made other than that the telephone answering service works with an average at the beginning of the service of 2.7 calls per hour. For the three month period, October - December 1973, an average of 15.9 questions per hour were answered at the card catalog, 217 of which were serials questions. The use of T-shirts is a help.

The recommendations agreed upon at the Reference/Task Force meeting were these:

1. Card catalog assistance should be provided at the card catalog on a permanent basis for at least 40 hours per week. It would be desirable to provide some service on weekends when assistance is particularly needed.
2. The Technical Services Department seems to be the appropriate unit to assume responsibility for the service, thus providing benefits in terms of the user, the catalog, and staff morale. The Reference staff, serving as a resource for orientation, would work closely with the unit who assumes responsibility for the project.
3. The units providing the service should receive compensatory time in the form of an additional position.

March 21, 1974

TASK FORCE CARD CATALOG PROJECT

March 1973 -- Project proposal accepted by Everett T. Moore, Reference and Technical Services Department

April 1973 -- Project begins

May 1973 -- Task Force makes suggestions for signs and for catalog improvements

August 1973 -- Report made to Everett T. Moore, et al

October 1973 -- Phones installed

October 1973 -- Monographic catalogers express an interest in the project

October 1973 -- Resource Committees discussion

November 1973 -- Begin to wear T-shirts at the public catalog

November 1973 -- Task Force backup staff added to project

December 1973 -- Reference requests locks to be put on phones and the phones be left out for Reference use

February 1974 -- Reference/Task Force meeting to discuss project's value and make recommendations

March 1974 -- Task Force report proposing temporary continuance of project and making recommendations.

TASK FORCE

November 6, 1973

PUBLIC CARD CATALOG PROJECT:

RANDOM SAMPLE OF QUESTIONS

SUBMITTED BY: Task Force

1. Now that I have the call number, where do I go?

2. When the card says "Special Collections" and says "Another copy" further down, what does that mean?

3. I found a card that says Village Voice see under Newspapers, New York, Village Voice. Now do I go to the Powell Library?

4. What is the Catalog Supplement?

5. What does "restricted use" mean?

6. Is there a listing of periodicals at UCLA by language?

7. How many of these numbers (call numbers) do I need to write down and what do these numbers mean?

8. What does the note "Photocopy positive" mean? Where is the book?

9. How do I look this up (printed citation in hand) Trans. New York, Academy of Sci.?

10. Where are college catalogs?

11. This (PC card tray in hand) is very old. Would it be in a locked area?

12. This book (author-title citation in hand) is not in the catalog.

13. What does this note on the PC card mean: "for holdings see main card"?

14. Where are the 1973 issues of Popular Science?

15. Is this book in this library (main card followed by a branch check card)?

16. Patron was looking for "Actas del Segundo Congress International der Hispanistas." He looked under "Actas" and under "Segundo". Did not try "Congreso...", which gave cross reference to International Congress of Hispanists.

17. Patron looking for book by E. M. Marshall - could find only Eliot Marshall. The book was under Elizabeth Marshall.

18. How do I find something in the U. S. section?

19. The book is not in the catalog, would it be in the Educ/Psych Library?

20. How do I look for a name beginning with Mc...?

21. How do I find this book? It is not listed in the card catalog.

22. I am looking for a book from Iran, are all the foreign books in a separate place?

23. I have the author but no title. Is there a separate author listing?

24. How do I find a book on vegetation in New Zealand?

25. I am looking for Liverpool University. Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology. Should I look under Liverpool?

26. How do I find these periodicals?

27. I need some information by this place called ERIC (Education Resources Information Center) My teacher says it's on microfilm. Can you help me find it?

28. Where are the stacks?

29. Patron looking for Universe Reformation of 1898 found historical period of dynasty ending in 1912 but hadn't realized another period for 19th century also existed.

30. Where are the HB's? How am I supposed to know that?

31. I can't find these newspapers?

32. How do I find these newspapers?

33. Card says Inst. Intl. Dev. (no call number) where do I find this book?

34. What does "CLU" on card mean?

35. What does * mean?

36. How do I look up this magazine?

37. What do the words (tracings) at the bottom of the page mean?

38. Are subject and/or titles in this catalog?

39. Patron looked up article in journal under author.

40. Is author's birth date the publication date?

41. Is there a list of periodicals at UCLA?

42. What does the red type on a card mean?

43. Does the phrase Music Library above the call number mean the book is only in the Music Library?

44. Do I go to the Loan Desk if there is a slip with a funny number on it?

August 6, 1973

EVERETT MOORE:

Early this spring the Library Task Force took surveys on the use of the Catalog Supplement. As a result of this experience, a need for instruction on its use and in the use of the card catalog was overwhelmingly apparent. It was proposed that Task Force personnel man a card catalog information desk to give basic assistance in the use of the catalog and to refer patrons as needed to other reference and information points. After consultation with related units it was decided to do this on a limited schedule for a period of six months.

A six-month final report with recommendations was planned for the end of the Task Force card catalog project in October 1973; however, since concepts about several aspects of the project have changed since its beginning in April 1973, a report with recommendations can be made now.

The Task Force card catalog project staff feel that sufficient facts are at hand and hope that with this early report some decisions can be reached before the beginning of the fall quarter when assistance in the use of the card catalog is especially necessary.

Both the main library at UCB and the Law Library at the University of Michigan are permanenetly allocating one FTE to similar assignments. Reports relating to their procedures and views are attached.

Also appended is a table of statistics compiled to date by the Task Force based on two hours of service per day. A comparison of the respective available monthly averages from our study (492), and from Michigan (528) indicates that the latter is responding to approximately 7 per cent more questions in eight hours than we are in two. However, by hypothetically extending our statistics over an eight-hour period, and keeping in mind that the two hours we covered were expected to be the busiest time, our total would be 272 per cent greater than theirs. The figures used for comparison are very rough, and in any event a number count in assessing this type of service has obvious deficiencies; however, it can be said with certainty that our demonstrated need is greater than that of an important branch of a major university library which has appointed one full-time position to this post. The real question is how much does the library want to help the user and how much does the library staff want to know the user's needs.

The Task Force project staff can unconditionally and emphatically state that from experience on this project, on their feet moving among the users, that the Library's prime concern and raison d'etre should be to help the user and learn the user's needs, and the need is great, if not always in number, in intensity.

Furthermore, THE CARD CATALOG AT UCLA'S LIBRARY IS A COMPLICATED TOOL INCOMPREHENSIBLE TO THE PATRON AND REQUIRES CONSTANT ON-THE-SPOT INTERPRETATION. The library staff in various committees constantly discusses the user and the catalog. Indeed, more than one-third of the

45. My professor said to look on the New Acquisitions shelf where books are listed under subject. Where is it?

46. Where is the Clark Library. Can I take out books from there?

47. Where do I look up the Civil War?

48. Patron very indignant because a book (located in College Library) was only listed under author, not title and author was a difficult Chinese name to find.

49. What does film over the call number mean and where is this?

50. Do these notes "Film copy. Positive" Detatched typescript, etc., mean we have the book or only the film copy?

staff spend their working lives in the construction of the catalog, yet many of the staff have little or no direct or practical knowledge of the user. A three-month stint of three to five hours per week would be more than compensated for in most ordinary work situations and would prove invaluable to the staff to say nothing of the benefit to the patrons. The awards to the staff in terms of morale and work enlightenment are invaluable.

TASK FORCE PROJECT STAFF

Roberta Nixon
Lorelyn Lewis
Suzanne Shellaby
Cathy Whitman

RN:LL:SS:CW:sm
Attachments
cc: Page Ackerman
Paul Miles
Ann Hinckley
Norah Jones
Diane Kennedy

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

- User reaction to the project has been very favorable.
- One of the original aims of the project, to provide instruction in the use of the Catalog Supplement has been overshadowed by the great need for instruction in the use of the card catalog and in the use of the library.
- Agressive behavior on the part of the staff often uncovers users needing help (see also the Law Library letter).
- When one patron sees help being given, several others invariably line up for assistance.
- Serials questions comprise one-third of the questions asked.
- Non-card catalog inquiries are not difficult to recognize and refer to the Reference Librarians.
- Patrons do return for help.
- See the attached notes from CU and from Michigan.
- Users do not understand how to use the library. They come to the card catalog expecting to find everything they need. They can be referred to Reference Librarians if help is at hand at the card catalog.
- Users frequently only copy numbers--not the letters of the call numbers.
- The card catalog appears to be a tool for library staff, not the average user.
- Morale and learning factors for the staff involved cannot be overemphasized.

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

"What floor is this call number in the stacks?"

"What does (branch) mean over the call number?"

"Does library have this book too (branch) name over call number?"

"What does 'CLU' mean?"

"Does CLU mean it's only in College Library?"

"Are journals listed in the catalog?"

"I've looked under author and title and you don't have this book."
(Usually we do.)

"Where do I find something on (subject)?"

"Where is the Clark Library?"

"Where can I find this journal article?"

"What does 'For holdings see...' mean?"

"What does IIR and no call number mean?"

"Where is microfilm, Photo, etc.?"

"I can't find this newspaper in catalog under title."

May 2, 1973

ANN HINCKLEY:

At the finish of the Card Catalog Information Project a report with recommendations is planned; however, at the end of one month we would like to offer our impressions thus far and put forth two suggestions in the hope that others may have recognized the same situations as problems and perhaps solutions could be explored before six months have passed.

Frequently, at least twice each hour, a patron after finding the call number of a book asks directions to a stack level. True he will eventually find the floor guide by or in the elevator but it would seem a great step toward improving service to provide a stack directory at several points within the card catalog area.

"CLU" stamped on the catalog card is confusing to patrons. On several occasions patrons have interpreted "CLU" to mean College Library as a location. One patron actually went to College Library. Would Technical Services consider putting "CLU" on the verso of the card or omitting it from the public card catalog?

A total of 588 questions or directions were given during the month. There seem to be little correlation between Reference desk statistics and Task Force statistics as the attachment shows. As a great many of the questions seemed to involve location of serial titles, at the request of the Serials Department, we have begun to tab these questions separately. Clark Library and Photographic information questions are frequently asked.

Favorable comments from students, faculty and staff are numerous. There have been two unfavorable comments. One, was a misunderstanding of the project as a policing operation; the other may be a compliment depending on point of view. It was, "How can the library afford you?"

Other staff have expressed interest in participating in the project. The personal reward and morale building factors for the Task Force staff who previously had little opportunity to receive instant satisfaction for their efforts are immeasurable.

Roberta Nixon
TASK FORCE

RN:ib
ATTACH.
cc: ETM
PM
Norah Jones
James Cox
Diane Kennedy

University of California, Los Angeles
Technical Services Task Force

March 8, 1973

ANN HINCKLEY:

Task Force Card Catalog Information Project

This project grew out of the Task Force surveys on the use of the Catalog Supplement. A need for instruction on its use and in the use of the card catalog was overwhelmingly apparent. Subsequent discussions with staff in the Reference, Technical Services and Circulation Department have brought the concept of the project to this point:

Project definition: To provide assistance in the use in the Catalog Supplement and of the URL card catalog. Users will be referred to the Reference Desk at any time that Reference help is indicated. Phone service will not be attempted at this time.

Time: The project will last for a period of six months beginning April 1, 1973, daily from 11 to noon and from 1 p.m. to 2 p.m.

Place: Midway in the URL card catalog near the Catalog Supplement table there will be a lectern or a table to serve as a focal point for the Task Force staff.

Signs: During hours of service at the lectern will be a sign saying, "Card Catalog Information". "For Card Catalog Information, consult Reference staff" will be posted at other hours. Staff will wear 2" x 4" badges saying "Card Catalog Information".

Staff: Four Task Force members will be regularly assigned to the project. A schedule is attached. Staff will not sit at a desk but will "roam" the area to give assistance.

Statistics: The Task Force staff will keep statistics on service given in the categories outlined on the attached sheet. Circulation Department and Reference Department may keep correlated statistics during this period.

Project Evaluation: The Task Force will conduct another Catalog Supplement Use Survey at the end of the project. Task Force will summarize the project with a narrative report at its conclusion.

Roberta Nixon

RN:ib
ENCLS.
cc: Jame Cox
Norah Jones
Paul Miles
Everett Moore

TASK FORCE CARD CATALOG INFORMATION SCHEDULE

WEEK OF:
April 2, 16, 30
May 14, 28
June 11, 25

	11-12 Noon	1-2 p.m.
M	Lorelyn Lewis	Cathy Whitman
T	Suzanne Shellaby	Roberta Nixon
W	Lorelyn Lewis	Cathy Whitman
TH	Suzanne Shellaby	Roberta Nixon
F	Lorelyn Lewis	Cathy Whitman

WEEK OF:
April 9, 23
May 7, 21
June 4, 18

	11-12 Noon	1-2 p.m.
M	Roberta Nixon	Suzanne Shellaby
T	Cathy Whitman	Lorelyn Lewis
W	Roberta Nixon	Suzanne Shellaby
TH	Cathy Whitman	Lorelyn Lewis
F	Roberta Nixon	Suzzanne Shellaby

TASK FORCE CARD CATALOG INFORMATION PROJECT

DATE:

HOUR:

STAFF

Card Catalog Information		Directional Information	Referrals	
Card Catalog	Cat. Sup.		Reference	Other

February 5, 1974

TASK FORCE USE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SUBGROUP C OF THE WORKING GROUP ON PUBLIC CATALOGS

On behalf of Subgroup C of the Working Group on the Public Catalogs, the Task Force, in order to explore for Subgroup C, the mechanics of a card catalog user survey in terms of practicality, devised a questionnaire and in the fourth and fifth week of the Winter Quarter, January 23 to 30, 1974, interviewed 300 URL card catalog users.

The Questionnaire

The 15 point questionnaire (attachment 1) was used by the interviewer checking off answers during the interview. At the end of the first day the questionnaire was revised, question no. 16 was added and the revised version (attachment 2) was used for the rest of the project with modifications by the interviewer. The seemingly illogical yes/no answers to questions 8 to 11 were interpreted by the interviewer from the users answers. A question inquiring if the interviewee would be interested in taking a course was thought of too late to be included. Further revisions in the Questionnaire would be useful were the project to continue.

The Place of the Interviews

All interviews were conducted within the University Research Library with the exception of six interviews conducted in the court area directly in front of URL.

The Timing

The time within the Quarter seemed ideal in order to reach a large user population; however, the concentration of the interviews, 300 interviews by 6 staff conducted between 9 and 5 on 6 consecutive class days was beginning to reach a saturation point by the sixth day, that is, users were being approached for the second time. The URL turnstile exits for that period averaged 5,000 from 9 to 6 p.m.

The URL user was most cooperative and helpful particularly when the purpose of the interview was made clear. Only 1 per cent said they were too busy for an interview.

The Interviewer

Librarians and LA's with experience in the library and the public catalog conducted the interviews. Some experienced a certain reluctance in approaching people, but once an approach was made, the interview went smoothly. Some of the answers to the questionnaire seem to reflect the particular approach of the individual interviewer. The project, an entirely new experience, was interesting, enlightening, rewarding and stimulating.

Data Gathered

On the whole the data gathered from the questions directly contradicted information the Task Force group has learned about the user who asks for help at the public catalog. The questions were not of the kind to overcome the users reluctance to admit his lack of knowledge about the catalog use or to help him recognize the complexity of the card catalog. Many of the comments made in response to questions 15 and 16, however, do support the Task Force's feeling about the user.

Card Catalog Use Questionnaire with comments

1. Status (check one)

46%	UCLA Undergraduate
35%	UCLA Graduate
1%	Extension
2%	Undergraduate--other college or university
2%	Graduate--other college or university
2%	Academic UCLA
4%	Staff--UCLA Library
1/2 of 1%	Staff--UCLA non-library
7%	Other

The number of Undergraduates using URL, perhaps, is not suprising, but there was an indication from responses to requests for interviews that many undergraduate students use URL as a study hall. The variety of users was interesting. There were users who identified themselves as alumni, three writers, a district attorney, faculty from the University of Pittsburg, University of Michigan, Cal Arts, USCD, USI and USC.

2. Why do you usually use the card catalog? (check one or more)

51%	Class assignment
70%	Research
11%	Job assignment
32%	Personal interest

These catagories of use need redefining. There seemed to be a tendency for the user to choose the "research" catagory of the "class assignment" catagory without making too close a distinction between them. Also "personal interest" might better be listed as "leisure reading" since some interpret personal interest as research.

3. How often do you use the card catalog?

22%	Daily
46%	Weekly
18%	Monthly
11%	Less frequent than any above

No comment

4. Do you usually look in the card catalog for:

70%	Author?
45%	Title?
54%	Subject?

The answers to this question should indicate priorities of use since many users employ all three approaches in varieties of order.

5. Has the filing arrangement in the catalog ever confused you?

36%	Yes
64%	No
___	How?

This question elicited an almost automatic "No" and those responding "Yes" often were unable to cite the cause of their filing difficulties.

The Task Force card catalog workers felt that the user fails to recognize the complexity of the catalog filing and often may attribute failure to locate an item to other causes such as the library not having the book.

6. What information do you use on the catalog card?

100%	Author	.02%	Date	.01%	Tracings
83%	Title	.019%	Edition	.02%	Holdings
.018%	Place	.015%	Pagination	.01	Notes
.019%	Publisher	.018%	Series	100%	Call Number

7. Do you ever have questions about information on the catalog card?

36%	Yes
64%	No

(6-7) Interviewing for these questions pointed up the users almost total lack of use or understanding of the information on the card catalog.

8. How can you tell which library a book is in?

87%	Yes
13%	No

9. How do you find periodicals in the catalog?

54%	Yes
46%	No

10. How do you look for a newspaper in the catalog?

26%	Yes
74%	No

11. How do you research a specific subject in the catalog?

75%	Yes
25%	No

12. Do you know what the Catalog Supplement is?

63%	Yes
37%	No

(8-12) Again experience working at the public catalog with users indicates a greater lack of knowledge about these items than the questionnaire shows. The yes/no to questions 8-11 indicated whether the users answer was correct. The Task Force project staff only meets the user who recognizes he needs help.

13. Do you usually find what you are looking for in the card catalog?

84%	Yes
16%	No

The 84% yes response to this question often seemed inconsistent with other answers by the same patron. The response was followed 50% of the time by the remark that the book was not on the shelf.

14-15-16.

Responses to these questions (attached) are listed without attempt at summary or conclusions other than indicating the number of times similar comments were made.

14. If you don't find what you are looking for in the card catalog, what do you do?

(Number)	
158	-Ask for help (a Reference Librarian, a Librarian, the Information person)
46	-Did not answer the question
31	-Give up
18	-Try another library (USC, Cal Tech, Powell, LAPL)
16	-Use the bibliographies (In Reference, NUC or CU)
7	-Look on the shelves at close call numbers
6	-Wait and check again
5	-Try another subject heading
5	-Try Circulation
5	-Buy the book
3	-Check on the citation

15. Do you have any suggestions for the improvement of the catalog?

(Some general comments. Users were either surprisingly complimentary or didn't say anything.)

-The Reference staff is brilliant

-The Reference staff is helpful

-The library is rather nice

-The library is the best of the three schools I attended

-One of the best libraries I've used all over the world

-Overwhelming

-Pretty good

-Satisfied

-Good

-Library doing a good job

-Good system

The Catalog

(Number)

-Really exhaustive

-Well organized

-Good catalog for its size

-Addicted - loves it - the bigger the better

-Impressed by the catalog

-Efficient for use

-It is pretty good - lots of variety

-It's good

2 -Satisfied

-Functions well for a library of this size if you are not afraid to ask at the Reference Desk

-Problems are not in the catalog but the user

The Catalog (continued)

(Number)	
	-Any set-up would cause problems
	-Catalog is the only part I don't have a complaint about
	-People should rely on Reference books and not on the catalog
2	-Too big
	-Proof read whole catalog
	-Much better ten years ago
	-Fine, after a class with M. Lichtheim
	-"Get Professor Gullans to tell you. He spends 15 minutes each class complaining."
2	-Computerize
	-Dewey decimal is easier
	-The physical arrangement is bad - Tunnel arrangement should be circular or square
	-Too far from A to J
	-Drawers often out of order
	-Chain pencils to the desks
	-Dictionary arrangement is helpful
3	-Make the filing easier to use and grasp
	-File Mc under Mc
	-More series should be analysed
5	-Conferences, universities and Corporate entries are hard to find
	-Put book articles in catalog
	-Voluminous authors are hard to use
	-Criticism about one author should be chronological
10	-Make additional cross references
2	-Catalog card should include an abstract of the book
	-Put in see also's at the end of subjects

The Catalog (continued)

(Number)

2 -Use different colored cards for authors and titles

-Use different colored cards for languages

-Use more guide cards

4 -Make transliteration consistent for Near Eastern and Oriental languages

-Put periodicals in one file

-Make multiple listings for journals

-Journals should be cataloged the same for all libraries

-Improve newspaper listings

-Periodical holdings cards are confusing

2 -Put months and years on holding cards

-Keep holdings cards up to date

4 -Catalog Supplement should be by subject too

-Catalog Supplement should include in-process and on order books

-Standardize rules for double surnames

-Take catalog cards out for missing books

-Put in the catalog notes as to where other libraries are

-Teach the use of the subject heading book

-Give the floor numbers along with the call number

-Give English translations of foreign books

-Break subjects down more

-File Hebrew as Hebrew not transliterated

10 -Put up signs with basic rules

-How to find headings i.e. Cal State University - more signs, asking is embarassing

3 -A class to teach how to use the library - pass/fail maybe

-Nobody taught me how to use the library. I didn't learn until Graduate School

The Catalog (continued)

(Number)	
3	-Would love to see a course taught
5	-Directory for Reference books would be nice
	-Publicize the Reference catalog
3	-Put out a booklet on use of the catalog
5	-Put more full time staff in the catalog
	-Having staff at the PC is helpful
	-Having staff at the PC is beautiful idea
2	-Have staff in the stacks
	-Put a shelf list on every floor
3	-Return to closed stacks
	-Exclude Undergraduates
	-Arrangement of the stacks should be improved
2	-Quicker return of books to the shelves
	-Chaos in Shakespeare shelves
4	-There is a two year lag for new books even with Catalog Supplement
	-Speed up
2	-Get more copies of needed books
	-More funds to buy lost books
	-More current fiction
	-Should be feedback on orders
	-Ordering books is too time consuming
	-Need personal book order service for students
4	-Too crowded at 5
	-Check out system like public libraries-too easy to steal books
	-Publicize receipts of returned books

16. Is there anything you would like to know about the card catalog?

(Number)

-What does the asterisk mean?

-How do I find something on Women in Prison?

-How do I find something on Indians?

-How do I find something on Womens Studies?

-How do I find something on Urban Sprawl?

6 -Please explain the call number?

-Where can I order a book for the library?

-Where is Microfilm?

-Are the x books arranged?

-How do I research a special subject?

-How do I find newspapers?

-How are subjects filed?

-Are Chicano and Afro American Studies library cards filed in the card catalog?

-Where do the catalog cards come from?

2 -How recent is the Catalog Supplement?

-What is the difference between College and URL?

-I would like a general orientation of the library.

-Who decides what library gets what books?